A STUDY OF THE JACOB TRADITION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

A STUDY OF THE JACOB TRADITION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Theology

---

by
John Gerald Mitchell
September 1969

APPROVAL SHEET

A STUDY OF THE JACOB TRADITION IN THE
OLD TESTAMENT

John Gerald Mitchell

Read and Approved by:

Donald L. Williams (Chairman)

John Joseph Owens

Frank Stagg

Marvin E. Tate

Date November 5, 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS vii

PREFACE viii

CHAPTER

I. METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS FOR A STUDY OF THE JACOB TRADITION 1
- A. History of Approaches to the Jacob Tradition 2
  - 1. The Jacob Narratives as Literal History 3
  - 2. Jacob as a Degraded Deity 4
  - 3. Wellhausen's Ethnological Approach . . . 6
  - 4. Hermann Gunkel's Approach 9
  - 5. Aetiological Approach 12
  - 6. Myth and Ritual Approach 16
  - 7. Archaeological Illumination 19
  - 8. Conclusion 20
- B. Methodological Foundations for Tradition Study 21
  - 1. The Problem of the Sources 21
  - 2. The Problem of History 26
- C. Conclusion 28

II. ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRE-YAHWISTIC JACOB TRADITION 30
- A. Pre-Yahwistic Form and Structure of the Jacob Tradition 32
  - 1. Pre-Yahwistic Literary Form 33
  - 2. Pre-Yahwistic Structure 35
    - a. Cultic Legends 37
    - b. Cycle of Tradition 38
    - c. Historical Credo 41
- B. The Jacob Tradition and the Tribal League . . 43
  - 1. Joshua 24 45
  - 2. Deuteronomy 26:5-11 54
  - 3. Conclusion 60
- C. Historical Significance of Bronze Age Jacob 61
  - 1. The Bronze Age World of Jacob 62
    - a. Jacob and the Merneptah Stele 62
    - b. The Amarna Period 65

chapter page

c. The Hyksos Movement 68
d. Hurrians and Patriarchal Customs . . 70
e. Amorite Shepherds 74
f. History of the Name Jacob 77
2. Transmission of the Pre-Yahwistic Jacob Tradition 84
a. Geographical Locale of Unattached Jacob Tradition 85
b. The Holy Places of the Jacob Tradition 92
(1) The East-Jordan Holy Places . . 93
(a) Mizpah of Gilead 93
(b) Mahanaim 96
(c) Penuel 98
(d) Succoth 105
(e) Atad beyond Jordan 107
(f) Summary 110
(2) The West-Jordan Jacob Tradition 110
(a) Shechem 111
(b) Bethel 125
(c) Other West-Jordan Sites . . 133
c. Jacob and the House of Joseph 140
d. Summary 157

III. THE JACOB TRADITION AND JUDAH 161
A. The Jacob Tradition and the United Monarchy 163
1. Historical Connection between Jacob and David 163
2. Cultic Connection between Jacob and David 170
a. Jacob and the Election of Jerusalem 170
b. Jacob and the Election of David . . . 173
3. Yahwistic Connection between Jacob and David 175
a. Historical Allusions 175
b. David in the Blessing of Jacob . . . 178
c. Unification of Tribes by Genealogy . 187
4. Summary 196
B. The Jacob Tradition in Judah During the Divided Monarchy 198
1. Isaiah of Jerusalem and Jacob 198
a. The God of Jacob 199
b. The House of Jacob 202
c. Other References to Jacob 205

chapter page

2. Jacob and Micah 206
    a. Heads of Jacob 206
    b. The Transgression of Jacob 207
    c. Summary 210
C. The Reinterpretation of Jacob after 587 B.C. 211
1. Jeremiah and the Jacob Tradition 212
    a. Sympathy for Jacob 212
    b. Jacob and David 214
2. Jacob and Ezekiel 217
3. Exilic Isaiah and Jacob 220
    a. Jacob and Israel 221
    b. Jacob and the Exodus Theology 224
4. The Post-Exilic Jacob Tradition 227
    a. Jacob in Isaiah 55-66 228
    b. Jacob in Malachi 230
    c. Post-Exilic Significance of Jacob in Psalms 231
    d. The Priestly Redaction of the Jacob Tradition 235
5. Summary 239
D. Transmission of Jacob Tradition in Judah . . 240

IV. THE JACOB TRADITION AND THE NORTHERN KINGDOM . . 244
A. Jacob and Jeroboam I 247
B. The Elohistic Jacob Tradition 251
1. Elohistic Characterization of Jacob . . . 253
2. Blessing of Jacob 254
3. Transcendence of Jacob's God 256
4. Jacob's Concern with Foreign Gods 256
5. Sanctuaries of Elohistic Jacob 258
6. Nationalism in Elohistic Jacob 261
C. Northern Traditions of Jacob in Psalms . . . 263
1. Psalm 77 263
2. Psalm 78 264
3. Psalm 81 266
D. The Jacob Tradition and Northern Prophets . . 269
1. Jacob in Amos 269
2. Jacob in Hosea 276
    a. Source of Hosea's Jacob Tradition . . 276
    b. The Accusation of Jacob 278
E. The Jacob Tradition and Deuteronomy 283
F. Summary 287

V. CONCLUSIONS 291
A. History of Transmission 292
B. History of Significance 297
C. Contribution to Old Testament Research . . . 300

page
BIBLIOGRAPHY 303
ABSTRACT 331
VITA 334

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

AASOR	*Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
ANE	James B. Pritchard (ed.), *The Ancient Near East: An Anthology of Texts and Pictures*
ANET	James B. Pritchard (ed.), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 2nd ed.
BA	*The Biblical Archaeologist*
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
BDB	Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*
CBQ	*The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
ET	*The Expository Times*
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
IB	*The Interpreter's Bible*
IDB	*The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
JTS	*The Journal of Theological Studies*
LXX	The Septuagint
MT	The Massoretic Text
RB	*Revue Biblique*
RSV	Revised Standard Version
SJT	*Scottish Journal of Theology*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*

PREFACE

This dissertation originated as an attempt to examine the Jacob tradition in the prophecies of Exilic Isaiah (Isa. 40-66) because the name of Jacob was observed as occurring an unusually large number of times in Isaiah 40-49. The almost complete absence of material on the formation and development of the Jacob tradition in the Pentateuch prompted a revision in the scope and emphasis of this dissertation. Therefore, the thrust of the study of the Jacob tradition was shifted to include the overall history and significance of the Jacob tradition in the Old Testament.

The broad scope of this study of the Jacob tradition prevents a thorough treatment of every aspect and appearance of this tradition in the Old Testament. Although this study had been selective of necessity, it also has been as thorough as space would permit. A longitudinal study of the Jacob tradition is justified because it is one of the few traditions in the Old Testament that shows such a long history of usage by Israel; Jacob is associated with the origins of Israel and the post-exilic material of Malachi. A longitudinal view of the Jacob tradition should provide important observations on the history and significance of the tradition for Israel.

The aim of this study is to investigate the use and significance of the Jacob tradition by the Hebrew people.

One of the concerns of this three-fold aim will be to isolate the elements of the Jacob tradition which are associated with places and events in the history of the Hebrews. A second interest of this study will be to observe how the national, religious, and ethical factors have influenced and shaped the Jacob tradition. The sources will be examined critically in an attempt to detect evidence of a bias in the collectors and preservers of the tradition. All of the approaches to the study of traditions will be brought to bear upon the sources of the Jacob tradition. The third facet of this three-fold aim is to show the theological significance of the Jacob tradition for the Hebrew people. The different aspects of this aim are not to be viewed as separate sections of this study, but as necessary considerations of the history of the Jacob tradition.

To achieve this aim means that the research must go beyond an examination of the historical context for the period in which Jacob is reported to have lived.[1] This study is concerned with the historical impact of the traditions which grew up around the Jacob figure and with the use of this tradition in the later history of Israel.

In the biblical sources, Jacob was a patriarch who was closely associated with the origin of Israel and her religion. He was identified as the father of the tribes of Israel and as the recipient of significant manifestations of God at prominent holy places in East-Jordan and the hill country of northern West-Jordan. The tribes of Israel referred to themselves as the sons of Jacob, and Jacob was held in high regard in certain periods of Israel's history. The intention of this study is to investigate the Sitz im Leben of the Jacob tradition and to determine the significance of the Jacob tradition for later Israel.

---

[1] For the historical background, see J. M. Holt, _The Patriarchs of Israel_; Ignatius Hunt, _The World of the Patriarchs_.

This concern will involve tracing the history of clan activities of the people who had the strongest motives for remembering the Jacob tradition, i.e., the sanctuaries and people with whom Jacob is most closely associated. Although the complexity of the sources precludes complete objectivity of inferences and conclusions in this study, the importance of the Jacob figure in the biblical sources, the availability of new evidence on the history of the Hebrew people, and the development of new critical tools provide an adequate justification for a study of the Jacob tradition. A further encouragement for this study is the fact that the only serious study of the Jacob tradition ever to appear in English was an article which was written by Hermann Gunkel in 1919.[2]

The ambiguity and vagueness of certain critical terms in the works of various scholars on the study of traditions necessitates the definition of some of these terms as they will be used in this study. The term "cult" has been assigned so many different meanings that G. E. Wright has stated that the word cult is used so loosely that it should be dropped from serious discussion.[3] The term cult will be used in this study synonymously with "a system of worship."[4]

Confusion also exists in the use of the critical designations of the source strata of the Pentateuch; therefore, a brief definition of each of these critical terms as understood by this author will contribute to the clarity of this study. The Yahwistic stratum (J) refers to the Jerusalem redaction of the Pentateuch which originated against the background of the United Monarchy and continued in a fluid state for about two hundred years. The Elohistic thread (E) refers to the northern version of pentateuchal traditions which originated after the establishment of North Israel under Jeroboam I and which preserved some very ancient traditions. The Priestly stratum (P) denotes a redaction of pentateuchal traditions which was begun against the events and concerns of the Exile and was not completed until after the time of Ezra; however, P contains some ancient materials. Deuteronomy (D) is a collection of northern hortatory messages which were brought to Jerusalem after the fall of Samaria (722 B.C.) by priests and prophets who were instrumental in the compilation of the D material. The Deuteronomic Historian is a school of redactors who worked in the context of the Exile and who worked from a Jerusalem perspective.

---

[2] "Jacob," What Remains of the Old Testament and Other Essays, trans. by A. K. Dallas, pp. 150-86.

[3] "The Nations in Hebrew Prophecy," Encounter, 26: 229, 1965.

[4] Cf. the discussion of the definition of cult and the bibliography in Page H. Kelley, "Contemporary Study of Amos and Prophetism," Review and Expositor, LXIII:379-81, 1966. See also J. M. Myers, "The Cultus and Its Significance," Biblical Studies in Memory of H. C. Alleman, ed. by J. M. Myers, et al., pp. 205-24.

Similar problems of terminology exist in the critical study of the collections of prophecy in the Old Testament. The approach to the various prophets in this study is similar to the approach to the Pentateuch; the words and traditions of the prophets were collected and preserved by disciples and schools of a prophet. The designation for Second Isaiah, Deutero Isaiah, etc. will be "Exilic Isaiah," a name which does not presuppose any particular view of the composition of the entire Book of Isaiah.[5]

In an attempt to preserve a distinction which is sometimes used in the biblical sources, East-Jordan has been used as a general reference to the territory east of the Jordan River and sometimes northeast of the land of Palestine proper. Conversely, West-Jordan designates the general area west of the Jordan, including the territory southwest of Palestine.

Because of his special competence in the area of the subject of this dissertation, Donald L. Williams has provided this writer with exceptional guidance and encouragement which far exceeded his expected duties as a member of the writer's Committee of Instruction. Acknowledgement is also made of the writer's wife, Barbara, who in addition to her duties as a teacher, housewife, and mother, has typed the draft of this dissertation and shared in the anxieties and progress of each stage of the research and composition of this study.

---

[5] The name Exilic Isaiah was first seen by this author in an article by Donald L. Williams, "The Message of the Exilic Isaiah," Review and Expositor, LXV:423-32, 1968.

CHAPTER I

METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS FOR A STUDY OF THE JACOB TRADITION

CHAPTER I

METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS FOR A STUDY OF THE JACOB TRADITION

The question of a methodology for studying the patriarchal traditions in the Pentateuch has attracted the attention of the most renowned Old Testament scholars who have shown interest in a critical approach to the Bible. Although the method of studying the patriarchal traditions has received widespread attention by recent Old Testament scholarship, no apparent consensus of opinion has been achieved on the crucial issues of the form, content, preservation, and historicity of the sources. Therefore, a brief survey of past approaches to the Jacob tradition and a statement of the problems and the approach this study will assume is in order.

A. HISTORY OF APPROACHES TO THE JACOB TRADITION

Interest in the patriarchal figures has resulted in an array of views which closely parallel the various approaches to the criticism of the Old Testament. An attempt to classify the approaches according to scholars encounters the problem of the overlapping of views among the various schools of criticism and among the different scholars within a school of criticism; therefore, the various approaches to the Jacob tradition are not to be considered as exclusive. Some approaches are best described by their reflection of a certain school of criticism while other approaches are best described by a man or a group, since a particular man may employ more than one approach.

The Jacob Narratives as Literal History

Some scholars approach the patriarchal narratives as literal, historical documents of the events which the narratives purport to relate. E. J. Young has recently claimed that the patriarchal narratives were intended ". . . to be straightforward history, and this is substantiated by the testimony of the New Testament. . . ."[1] The evidence from archaeological research is used by the literal approach to "prove" the historicity of the biblical records of the patriarchal times. To this school of thought the Jacob narratives are literal, historical documents of the life and times of Jacob. The distinctive feature of this approach is its uncritical view of the sources of the Jacob tradition. Archaeological and comparative data are admitted as evidence only if it verifies the straightforward witness of the sources. This approach lacks validity because it does not take into account the variety of types of literature in the Pentateuch, does not allow for a synoptic view of the contents of the multiple sources, and does not give any basis to compilation dynamics.

---

[1] An Introduction to the Old Testament, rev. ed., p. 59.

Jacob as a Degraded Deity

According to some of the late nineteenth-century critics, a predominant factor in the formation of the patriarchal traditions of Israel was the mythology of other cultures. Asher, Gad, Edom, etc. were names of gods as well as names of tribes, and the myths about these figures related how the deities had been degraded to tribal heroes. Jacob was viewed as originally a Canaanite or Babylonian deity who was subsequently demoted to the rank of a human hero. Jacob and Esau recalled the Phoenician myth of the brother Samemroumos (high heaven). Sarah and Milkah, two goddesses of Haran, were thought to have some connection with the biblical figures who possessed the same names. The connection of Sarah with Abraham suggested that Abraham had been substituted for the Moon-God of Haran. The pastoral figure of Laban had been drawn from the Moon-God Lebana, who was represented as the shepherd of the stars. Jacob's wrestling with the figure at Jabbok was related to a similar encounter in a Titan myth, and Jacob was once a Titan god. The four wives of Jacob were the four phases of the moon, and Jacob's twelve sons were the twelve months;

the seven children of Leah were the gods of the days of the week.[2] This approach to the patriarchal traditions assumed that legends had their origin in myths; therefore, a search was launched by these critics for the mythical features in the patriarchal narratives.

The extreme examples of this approach were based upon speculation which viewed similarities between the names and characteristic numbers of Israel's traditions and the myths of other cultures as a direct dependence of Israel on other cultures. Thus, allusions to foreign deities were seen in the patriarchal narratives, and the most trivial incidents in the life of the patriarchs were transformed into myths which were patterned after known myths of other cultures. Isolated elements of various legends were often combined and expanded into a full-blown myth which had no parallel in any culture.[3]

This approach fails to take seriously enough the realistic view of the patriarchal figures by the Israelite writers and tradition circles. The mythological features of the patriarchal stories have been played down and historicized in the biblical sources. Adolphe Lods criticized this approach for its lack of appreciation for the unmistakable impress of the national religion of Israel; Yahweh has displaced any position another god may have played in the primitive stories.[4] The emphasis upon the Jacob figure as a degraded deity subsided in the first quarter of the twentieth century and is not discussed seriously today.[5]

---

[2] Cf. Eduard Meyer, Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme, pp. 267ff.; Hugo Gressmann, "Sage und Geschichte in den Patriarchenerzählungen," ZAW, 30:1-34, 1910; Adolphe Lods, Israel from Its Beginnings to the Middle of the Eighth Century, trans. by S. H. Hooke, pp. 161ff.

[3] Hermann Gunkel, The Legends of Genesis, trans. by W. H. Carruth, pp. 119-21.

Another serious criticism of this approach is its evolutionary view of history which concludes that the patriarchal narratives have very little historical content. The patriarchal figures were created from the patterns of mythical personalities in other cultures. Thus, the history of the Jacob tradition would be impossible prior to the Davidic kingdom.

Wellhausen's Ethnological Approach

Julius Wellhausen popularized the theory that the patriarchs were eponymous ancestors whose names were personal names which were used to designate a tribe or a nation. Jacob was a figure created in the Davidic era by J for the purpose of personifying the history and political struggles of the nation of Israel. Wellhausen stated that historical knowledge about the patriarchs could not be obtained from the patriarchal narratives since the documents were over eight hundred years later than the events they purported to relate. The patriarchal narratives could reveal historical knowledge only about the times in which the stories were written down by J in the tenth century, B.C.[6] Jacob, like Abraham, ". . . might with more likelihood be regarded as a free creation of unconscious art."[7] This theory regards the patriarchal traditions as ideal projections into the past of relations and movements in progress after the tribes had settled in Palestine. The patriarchs were not individuals, but were personifications of tribes and movements of tribes within the history of Israel.

---

[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 162.

[5] Cf. John Skinner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*, "The International Critical Commentary," 2nd ed., p. xxiv.

C. A. Simpson reveals his dependence upon the ethnological approach when he commented on Genesis 12:1-4, "Thus in vv. 1-4 Abraham is less an individual than a symbol or personification of the Israelite clans which had moved from the desert into Palestine and had settled at Hebron."[8] The Jacob story was used to answer the question, "Why had leadership passed from Edom to Israel?"[9] According to Simpson, Jacob was originally the father of the East-Jordan Israelite community. Jacob's name was derived from the pre-Israelite traditions of Canaan and was taken into Israelite traditions in the process of the unification of the tribes.[10] Jacob is not an individual, but is a clan figure who was developed by J to represent a community of tribes.

---

[6] Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel, trans. by J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies, p. 518.

[7] Ibid.

[8] "The Book of Genesis: Introduction and Exegesis," IB, Vol. 1, p. 571.

One major criticism of Wellhausen's approach to the study of traditions is the assumption that the Hexateuch was the product of a purely literary activity which was accomplished by the compilation of written documents; the critics evaluated these documents as the creations of the ages in which they were supposed to have been written, an approach which inevitably led to the discounting of the worth of the documents as historical sources. No account was taken of the existence and reliability of an oral stage of the biblical traditions. Archaeological data from other cultures has shown that some of the traditions which appeared in Genesis also appeared in other cultures; thus, the authors of the source documents did not create all of the traditions as Wellhausen had supposed.[11]

---

[9] _Ibid_., p. 667.

[10] _Ibid_.

[11] Cf. John Bright, "Modern Study of Old Testament Literature," _The Bible and the Ancient Near East_, ed. by G. Ernest Wright, pp. 1-26.

The evolutionary philosophy of history was the basis of Wellhausen's theory that Israel's religion developed from the most primitive forms to the highest within the Old Testament period. The religion of the Hebrew ancestors was customarily described as animism, or polydaemonism which evolved first into a national henothe~~s~~ism and finally into an ethical monotheism of the eighth-century prophets. The beliefs and practices which were reflected in the biblical sources were the beliefs and practices of the respective periods in which the documentary sources were written. Thus, the biblical sources could not be considered as sources of information regarding the period of the patriarchs. Archaeological evidence has contributed to the understanding of life in the Middle and Late Bronze Ages and has shown that the culture reflected in the patriarchal narratives is similar to the comparative evidence in the Bronze Age culture.[12]

Hermann Gunkel's Approach

A view which closely paralleled the development of form-criticism recognized Jacob as a figure who had been elevated from the status of an individual in the folk traditions of roving shepherds to the dignified estate of a national patriarch. The patriarchal traditions of Jacob were ancient "folk tales" which in a later and more developed age were combined with historical reminiscences. Following the leads of W. Wundt and H. Gressmann, Hermann Gunkel refined and applied the theory of Israel's traditions as deriving from folk traditions.[13] Gunkel's approach was characterized by its respect for the reliability of the oral stage of the tradition. The Jacob narratives, although not literal history in themselves, were credited with preserving authentic historical material in the traditions which reflected historical reminiscences. Gunkel viewed the original Jacob figure as a shepherd-type around whom local traditions gathered. As the need arose, these local traditions which explained various customs, events, and places in the life and history of the shepherds were adapted for the use of the Jacob group. After the amalgamation of some of the tribes of the shepherds, the Jacob figure became a national patriarch.

---

[12] *Ibid*.

These folk tales, whether Canaanite, foreign, or indigenous to the Jacob group, must have existed as independent units in various situations in the life of the shepherds. Some traditions had no other purpose than mere entertainment around a campfire. Other traditions were aetiological in nature, and still others were ancient ethnological myths of earlier ethnic groups and cities which were no longer extant.[14] Whatever the precise origin of the folk tales, they were adapted to the viewpoint and historical perspectives of those who preserved them.

---

[13] Cf. Hermann Gunkel, "Jacob," _What Remains of the Old Testament and Other Essays_, trans. by A. R. Dallas, pp. 150-86 (hereafter, Gunkel, "Jacob").

Since the basic work on the Jacob tradition has been done by Gunkel, his methodology should be considered in more detail.[15] Gunkel attempted to arrive at the "kernel" of the whole Jacob history by first removing "the upper layers in order to expose those beneath."[16] He assumed that all combinations of individual stories into larger complexes invariably belonged to a later stage in the compilation of the traditions. He observed how the historical element in each individual story was interwoven with matter of another kind and how this synthesis affected the figure of Jacob. After he had determined in what order he thought the stories were compiled, he peeled away those stories which were added at a later time in order to reach what he called "the original core."[17] This core was concluded to be the stories of conflict between Jacob (the shepherd-type) and Esau (the hunter-type).[18] To this "folk tale" about the achieving of ascendency of the shepherd culture over the more barbaric hunter culture, the Laban stories were added. Later, when Israel took an interest in her origins, she chose Jacob as one of the most popular figures which her nomadic traditions could provide.[19]

---

[14] Lods, op. cit., pp. 160-61.

[15] Gunkel, op. cit., esp. pp. 156-58.

[16] Ibid., p. 158. [17] Ibid., pp. 156-57.

[18] Ibid., p. 184.

One of the two fundamental failures of Gunkel's approach is his evolutionary view of the development of the traditions; his approach was based upon what he thought was a classification of "pure" types or categories, but the pure types do not exist as he described them. Gunkel's second weakness was his dependence upon an evolutionary view of the history of Israel, which resulted in a lack of appreciation for the religious faith of the early ancestors of Israel. Since Gunkel's time archaeologists have unearthed cultural, historical, and lexical data that offer valuable material for the reconstruction of a clearer picture of the history and religion of the patriarchal figures. The value of Gunkel's approach resides in its attempt to study the traditions of Israel in their oral stages, and for that reason this approach cannot be neglected in a study of the Jacob tradition.

Aetiological Approach

Albrecht Alt carried the approach of Gunkel one step farther in his article, "The God of the Fathers." Jacob was viewed as a cult hero who founded a system of worship which was celebrated at Bethel, Shechem, Dothan (?), Mahanaim, Penuel, and probably at Succoth.[20] Around the human figure of Jacob who had received a theophany from a deity were attached local traditions which were not originally associated with Jacob. The cult centers preserved the traditions in association with the deity which their ancestors had worshipped. Jacob was an individual of history, but the history was conveyed by the tradition of the cult.

---

[19] *Ibid*., pp. 185-86.

This approach is followed by Martin Noth in his treatment of the patriarchs in which he insists that the stories of the patriarchs were attached to various cultic sites where the traditions survived until they were later collected into unified cycles of tradition.[21] The patriarchal traditions were "conceived and developed" in the "amphictyony" after the descendants of the "fathers" had settled in Palestine and had seen the promise of the land fulfilled.[22] The patriarchs were rediscovered in the sanctuaries which had been founded by the patriarchs. Thus, many "patriarchs" were known by the various tribes, and the fact that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were remembered is attributed to the peculiar formation of the tradition of the Pentateuch. The essential point was that each patriarch was attached to the particular sanctuary which he was thought to have founded: each sanctuary preserved the traditions of its own patriarch. When later tribes rediscovered these traditions, the sites and even the names of the patriarchs were dropped in favor of the theological perspective of the later tribe. The patriarchal world is not to be studied, according to Noth, except in the context of the history of the so-called amphictyony. The important thing is that the patriarchs once existed as historical figures, but ". . . to make any definite historical assertions about the time and place, presuppositions and circumstances of the lives of the patriarchs as human beings . . ." is precarious.[23]

---

[20] Albrecht Alt, "The God of the Fathers," Essays on Old Testament History and Religion, trans. by R. A. Wilson, p. 51.

[21] The History of Israel, 2nd ed., trans. by P. R. Ackroyd, p. 120.

[22] Ibid.

A similar view is maintained by Gerhard von Rad who stressed the theological unification of the traditions of the patriarchs by later Israel.[24] The individual units originally belonged to very different places, with the various sanctuaries preserving the traditions with which the patriarch is associated. The inner unity of theme of all the traditions resulted from the interpretation of the promise given to the patriarchs by later groups. Disparate traditions were connected with the theme of promise by a systematic process of revision to obtain a theological unity. This unity belonged to a later phase of tradition, to a stage in which the promise was partially fulfilled during the Settlement. The form of the Jacob stories suggests that small groups preserved the old traditions which were mixed with the indigenous traditions. Thus, the possibilities of obtaining authentic history about the patriarchs out of the very complex source materials are very soon exhausted.[25]

---

[23] Ibid., p. 122.

[24] "History and the Patriarchs," ET, LXXII:213-14, 1960-61.

The distinction which von Rad and Noth make between the reliability of the sources of the patriarchal stories and the reliability of the traditions of the patriarchs which the sources contain is important. Noth justifiably has been criticized for his extreme practice of source analysis on the biblical records of the patriarchal traditions. Von Rad also can be criticized for his description of the Yahwist as a highly creative individual who redacted originally belonged to very different places, with the various sanctuaries preserving the traditions with which the patriarch is associated. The inner unity of theme of all the traditions resulted from the interpretation of the promise given to the patriarchs by later groups. Disparate traditions were co[illegible] theme of promise by a systematic proc[illegible]tain a theological unity. This [illegible] phase of tradition, to a stage in [illegible]tially fulfilled during the Se[illegible] Jacob stories suggests that smal[illegible]d traditions which were mixed wit[illegible]s. Thus, the possibilities o[illegible]story about the patriarchs out of [illegible]rce materials are very soon exhausted.[25]

---

[25] *Ibid*.

The distinction which von Rad and Noth make between the reliability of the sources of the patriarchal stories and the reliability of the traditions of the patriarchs which the sources contain is important. Noth justifiably has been criticized for his extreme practice of source analysis on the biblical records of the patriarchal traditions. Von Rad also can be criticized for his description of the Yahwist as a highly creative individual who redacted the traditions of Israel from a definite theological perspective. Caution also should be exercised against attributing too much importance to the location of a tradition at a particular sanctuary since people instead of places preserved oral traditions. Nevertheless, the approach of von Rad and Noth to the study of traditions will prove valuable.

---

[25] *Ibid.*

Myth and Ritual Approach

Although the British Myth and Ritual School has been concerned primarily with the "patterns" of kingship, prophecy, priesthood, and festivals in the ancient Near East, this school also has had a pervasive influence on the study of the patriarchal traditions.[26] The discovery and interpretation of the Ras Shamra texts led this school to see a link between the Ugaritic mythological poems and the religious literature of Israel. This Canaanite-Syrian literature provided a definite proof that Canaan and Israel belonged to the same culture area as Mesopotamia. By means of a combination of exegetical, anthropological, and folkloristic methods, the Myth and Ritual School presumed that the ancient Near East was the home of the mythical conceptions which appear in the Old Testament. "The religion of Israel as it appears in the Old Testament" shows signs of a deliberate assimilation of Canaanite cult practices which occurred during the Settlement period of Israel's history.[27] Israelite Canaan was viewed as a part of a vast culture area of the Near East which was dominated by Babylonian culture patterns in the fields of religion and spiritual and material culture in general. This approach is based on the assumption that Israel had been profoundly influenced by the inhabitants of Canaan and that a very rich treasure of myths which once existed in Canaan had played a central role in the system and life of the Hebrew people.[28]

---

[26] The term "myth" referred to the spoken part of a ritual which described what was being done; myth was the story which the ritual enacted. "Ritual" was used in the sense of a regular pattern of actions, of things prescribed to be done, which was concerned with the practical and pressing problems of the source and well-being of the community. S. H. Hooke, "The Myth and Ritual Pattern of the Ancient East," _Myth and Ritual_, ed. by S. H. Hooke, p. 3.

The main concern of the Myth and Ritual School in the study of the patriarchs was a reconstruction of the "myth" and "ritual" of the religion of the patriarchs. S. H. Hooke stated that three main problems confront the study of the mythology of the Old Testament: (1) what was the source and original form of the myths which are found in the Old Testament? (2) what modifications did the Hebrew writers or editors make in the mythical material which they borrowed from Canaanite or other sources? and (3) whether Israel produced any myths of its own?[29]

---

[27] Cf. Geo. Widengren, "Early Hebrew Myths and Their Interpretation," Myth, Ritual, and Kingship, ed. by S. H. Hooke, pp. 149-59; S. H. Hooke, "Myth and Ritual: Past and Present," ibid., pp. 1-21.

[28] Ibid., pp. 156-58.

So much overlapping of the Myth and Ritual School with the approaches of Gunkel, Alt, Noth, and von Rad is present that often little difference can be observed in the results of their work on the patriarchal traditions. The main reason the Myth and Ritual School is singled out in this historical survey is its emphasis upon the comparison between mythical features of the tradition of Jacob with the myths of the Canaanites and others. Although certain individuals of this school have shown too much dependence upon the older Pan-Babylonian School, the stress they have given to the Canaanite elements in the so-called religion of Israel will prove helpful in the study of the Jacob tradition. The comparative data and anthropological principles which the Myth and Ritual School employ have thrown light on many of the patriarchal traditions; therefore, the approach of the Myth and Ritual School can be of real service in the study of the Jacob tradition.

---

[29] Middle Eastern Mythology, p. 104.

Archaeological Illumination

In recent years the results of archaeological research have been used to establish that actual persons of the remote past are reflected in the patriarchal traditions. W. F. Albright has made use of archaeological data to show that much in the stories of the patriarchs reflects the customs and conditions of the age in which the patriarchs are set. John Bright gave vivid expression to the Albright view when he stated, "We can assert with full confidence that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were actual historical persons."[30] By showing that the culture of the ancient Near East during the twentieth to the fifteenth centuries B.C. was similar to the culture presented in the biblical sources of the patriarchal traditions, the patriarchs themselves were accorded vividness and detail which was not possible before the recent archaeological discoveries.

Archaeological research has portrayed Jacob as a chief of a sizable clan who lived during the Middle Bronze Age. However, the only actual evidence that the person Jacob ever lived is found in the complex sources of the Bible. Archaeology cannot prove that Jacob was a historical person, but the archaeological data can certainly be used to illuminate the background of the Jacob tradition which is preserved in the biblical sources.

---

[30] A History of Israel, p. 82.

Albright differs with Noth and others concerning the connection between the tradition and the locality with which the tradition is associated (Ortsgebundenheit). Albright maintains that traditions adhere to people rather than remain fixed to a place or sanctuary. Thus, ethnic groups who often changed their location were the circles who preserved the patriarchal traditions.[31] Noth, on the other hand, stressed the importance of the attachment of traditions to holy places at which they were preserved. G. E. Wright follows Albright in attributing all of the patriarchal material to "one confessional story" which was not connected so much with a cult place as with a particular group of people who found in the story an explanation of their existence.[32] Nevertheless, where a geographical feature or a particular site is an integral part of a tradition, the principle or Ortsgebundenheit is immensely valuable in elucidating the early traditions of Israel.

Conclusion

Each one of these approaches has made some contribution to the study of the Jacob tradition, but no one of them is sufficient in and by itself. The overall approach of Gerhard von Rad is probably the most comprehensive for the study of pre-literary traditions, but von Rad's approach should be supplemented with the cultural data that can be obtained from archaeological and anthropological materials. Since the study of traditions in the Old Testament is still in the developmental stage, revision and refinement of a methodology is necessary for the study of the Jacob tradition.

---

[31] Cf. John Bright, Early Israel in Recent History Writing, "Studies in Biblical Theology," No. 19, pp. 100-104.

[32] "History and the Patriarchs," ET, LXXI:294, 1959-60.

B. METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS FOR TRADITION STUDY

A study of the Jacob tradition must struggle with two basic problems: the reliability of oral tradition and the historical perspective of the sources. This study will assume "tradition-history" to be an inclusive method of studying the traditions of the Hebrews in their life-situation. Tradition-history assumes the use of the so-called "religio-historical," "form-critical," "archaeological," and any other method that will illuminate the history and significance of the Jacob tradition.

The Problem of the Sources

Sigmund Mowinckel has noted succinctly one of the problems which a study of the Jacob tradition will encounter when he wrote, "Every tradition that has come to us has passed through Jerusalemite mouths and pens. . . ."[33] The only direct testimony of the Jacob tradition which is available is found in the Old Testament itself. The first compilation of any sizable amount of biblical traditions is generally agreed not to have taken place before the Davidic era, while the final compilation did not take place until after the Exile.

Therefore, a gap of hundreds of years exists between the first compilation and the events which are related in the Jacob narratives of Genesis. The Jacob tradition should be examined and interpreted in light of what it is, and the historical and factual cannot be detached from the theological interpretation which Israel has given the life and character of the Jacob figure.[34] The Old Testament consists essentially of a series of reappraisals of the history of Israel in the light of new events and experiences. The so-called "theologies" of the Old Testament are reinterpretations of Israel's history.[35] Thus, before these sources can be used to obtain a reliable picture of the history of the Jacob tradition, they must be subjected to an examination of the nature of their transmission. At the same time, care should be exercised not to atomize the sources as some literary critics have tended to do. This study of the Jacob tradition will assume that major compilations of source material can be described as the traditional source-designations (J, E, D, P), although the results of the old literary-critical approach will not be accepted without a reexamination.

---

[33] "Tradition, Oral," IDB, Vol. R-Z, p. 683.

[34] D. R. Jones, "History and Tradition in Old Testament Studies," SJT, 17:219, 1964.

[35] _Ibid_.

Before the biblical sources of the Jacob tradition were compiled, they undoubtedly passed through a long process of transmission which was primarily by means of oral tradition. The Alt-Noth-von Rad School contends that the Jacob tradition originally existed as independent units of tradition and that these units were absorbed into blocks of tradition which focused upon a place or experience of Jacob and finally were collected into cycles of tradition according to the "interpretation" which the collectors wished to give to the life and character of Jacob. The concern here is to trace the vestiges and remnants of the process of oral tradition which is not always obvious in the sources. Yet, mnemonic constructions, certain cultic phenomena, historical and geographical allusions, borrowed elements, and hints of the "place in life" are important in tracing the history and the transmission of a tradition.

Much debate in recent years has focused on the nature and reliability of oral tradition. The Scandanavian school of Eduard Nielsen and others is often described as a critique of the literary criticism of a "book-minded, scissors and paste type."[36] Nielsen's approach is concerned with showing the accuracy and prevalence of oral tradition in the ancient Near East, even after the material was written down.[37] However, the reliability of oral transmission depends upon the circles who preserved it; therefore, the reliability is not always of the same degree.[38] The creative power of the worship, history, and theological stance of the tradition circles reveals how tradition circles could select either indigenous or foreign elements or alter existing traditions to suit the occasion and interests of the tradition circle.[39] Sigmund Mowinckel stressed that one should not exalt the present form of the tradition, emphasizing instead its historical development, in order to work back from the tradition to its historical basis. Mowinckel sought to distinguish between earlier and later strata of traditions and referred to the oral development from the individual unit to the collection, as well as to the fixed written text with canonical authority, which presupposes a fixed oral tradition.[40] Both traditio-historical and literary-critical methods are necessary in the study of traditions of the Old Testament, and these disciplines must be in constant interaction if a balanced approach is expected. The attempt to play one method against the other as an "either-or" approach is clearly mistaken.

---

[36] Cf. Krister Stendahl, "Implications of Form-Criticism and Tradition-Criticism for Biblical Interpretation," JBL, LXXVII:34, 1958.

[37] Cf. Eduard Nielsen, Oral Tradition, "Studies in Biblical Theology," No. 11.

[38] G. W. Ahlström, "Oral and Written Transmission," HTR, 59:69-81, 1966.

[39] Georg Fohrer, Introduction to the Old Testament, trans. by David Green, p. 102.

The same interaction should exist between form analysis and tradition-history in regard to the sources. Form criticism recognizes that each literary type originated from a definite need in a particular "situation in life" and that its form is closely bound up with this need. Oral tradition lives only as long as any practical, sociological, or ideological interest is connected with the tradition; therefore, the literary form in which the traditions are preserved is closely connected with the circles who preserved the stories and sheds light on the tradition and its preservers, as well as giving information about the nature of the transition from oral to written tradition.[41]

---

[40] Ibid., pp. 37-38. Cf. Sigmund Mowinckel, "Israelite Historiography," Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute, Vol. II, pp. 4-26.

The form in which the Jacob stories have been preserved cannot be identified in all cases. Mixed forms and a lack of agreement concerning the names and nature of the different literary types are also limitations of the use of form criticism in the study of traditions. The attempt to judge the historicity of the traditions on the basis of literary form alone is mistaken. Neither can valid historical conclusions be drawn from a developmental study of the types.[42] Each tradition should be studied individually in conjunction with all that can be learned about its sources.

The Problem of History

One of the most perplexing, and probably most debated, problems in the study of the Old Testament is the historicity of the biblical traditions. This problem is not unrelated to the reliability of the oral and written sources of the traditions, but the historical problem focuses upon the reconstruction of Israel's history. The question of the amount of factual history which the traditions contain will be prominent in the study of the Jacob tradition.

---

[41] Mowinckel, op. cit., pp. 683-85.

[42] Ben F. Philbeck, Jr., "The Traditions of Judah Prior to the Time of the Monarchy" (unpublished Th.D. dissertation), pp. 103-11.

The historicity of the traditions is often by necessity limited to an analysis of the origin, growth, interpretation, revision, and editing of the biblical tradition. Historicity of the traditions will always be in the realm of "probability," even though the degree of probability may be judged to be very high. This whole debate of the historicity of biblical traditions is vitally related to the question of the historical perspective which the Old Testament traditions present.

W. F. Albright has stated that historical analogy is a valuable tool for evaluating the historicity of the traditions of Israel. Archaeologists have discovered both documents and anthropological data with which the biblical traditions have been compared.[43] The "probable" setting for many biblical traditions can be "filled-in" by comparing the tradition with extra-biblical literature and anthropological information. However, archaeological evidence should not be used to "prove" the historicity of the biblical traditions; archaeological evidence can only be used to reconstruct a probable occasion for the tradition.

---

[43] Archaeology, Historical Analogy, and Early Biblical Traditions, p. 11.

The patriarchal traditions do not purport to be historical records in the modern sense of history. A national, religious, or ethical bias always is presupposed in the origin and preservation of a biblical tradition. An analogy should not be drawn between cultures which have no basis for comparison; neither should a later or foreign view of history be imposed upon the biblical traditions. Use of comparative evidence should be coupled with a careful study of the sources of the biblical tradition.

C. CONCLUSION

The above methodological foundations will be used to study the history of the Jacob tradition. The biblical sources will be critically examined for evidence of the geographical, cultural, and historical presuppositions which the Jacob tradition contains. By comparing this evidence with extra-biblical data an attempt will be made to identify the cultural origin of the Jacob tradition. The geographical locale and the form and content of the various elements of the Jacob tradition will reveal the method of preserving the Jacob tradition and the significance of the Jacob figure for the circles who preserved it.

After the origin and development of the oral stage of the Jacob tradition has been examined, the biblical sources will be used to try to determine how the Jacob tradition was compiled and fused with other traditions of Israel. An attempt will be made to show the influence of the history and interests of the cultic center in Jerusalem. The place which the Jacob tradition is assigned in the history and literature of Israel will show the theological significance which the Jacob figure had for particular periods in the history of Israel.

This study will approach the northern traditions as an independent body of tradition which existed in North Israel[44] from about 922-722 B.C. If the appearance of the Jacob tradition in the biblical sources which are identified as northern materials are examined, the results of this study will have implications for the nature of the Jacob tradition and its significance in the northern territory. The northern version of the Jacob tradition will be compared with the Jerusalem version to determine the origin and theological significance of the Jacob tradition during the various periods of the history of both kingdoms. This comparative study will also reveal how the Jacob tradition was shaped and altered by the history of the circles who preserved it.

---

[44] The term "North Israel" will be used in this study to refer to the territory and people of the northern tribes in order to distinguish between the Israel of the covenant tradition and the Israel which existed in the northern and eastern sections of Palestine.

CHAPTER II

ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRE-YAHWISTIC JACOB TRADITION

CHAPTER II

ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRE-YAHWISTIC JACOB TRADITION

Since recent scholarship generally agrees that the first major compilation of sources of the Old Testament took place during or soon after the existence of the United Monarchy in Israel,[1] a study of the origin and development of the Jacob cycle of tradition must venture behind the literary sources. By the time these sources reached their first stage of literary fixation,[2] the traditions of Jacob had assumed the form of a cycle of tradition. Later tradition circles shaped and rearranged elements of the Jacob tradition and added new material in accordance with the presuppositions and motives of these circles.[3] Therefore, this chapter will work back into the pre-Yahwistic stage of the Jacob tradition in reverse order of the probable chronological sequence.[4] This attempt to describe the origin and development of the Jacob cycle of tradition will investigate the literary nature of the tradition, its connection with early Israelite traditions, and the cult centers with which Jacob was associated.

---

[1] Artur Weiser, The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development, trans. by Dorothea M. Barton, p. 102 (hereafter, Weiser, Old Testament), dated J in the Davidic-Solomonic era. Georg Fohrer, Introduction to the Old Testament, trans. by David Green, p. 165 (hereafter, Fohrer, Introduction), dated J between 850 and 800 B.C. Otto Eissfeldt, The Old Testament An Introduction, trans. by Peter R. Ackroyd, pp. 197-98 (hereafter, Eissfeldt, Introduction), dated L (Lay) source between 950 and 850 B.C.

[2] Pre-Yahwistic will refer to the stage of traditions prior to the first major compilation of sources (cf. ante, Preface).

[3] Cf. Curt Kuhl, The Old Testament: Its Origins and Composition, trans. by C. T. M. Herriott, pp. 64-72 (hereafter, Kuhl, Old Testament).

A. PRE-YAHWISTIC FORM AND STRUCTURE OF THE JACOB TRADITION

A study of the pre-Yahwistic stage of the Jacob tradition presupposes that traditions were preserved during this period primarily by oral transmission, although isolated elements of a tradition may have had an independent existence in a written form.[5] Form and tradition criticism have been of invaluable help in studying the pre-Yahwistic traditions. Since the styles and patterns of speaking are in some profound sense a record of the inner nature of a people, the ways which a people forms and structures its thought processes into the language patterns of its culture reflect the motives, customs, and ideals of that people.[6] The situation in which a tradition originated is vitally connected with the content, form, and structure of the tradition.

---

[4] Note that this method is similar to Gunkel's approach to individual traditions; Gunkel peeled away layers of a tradition to reach its core. However, the approach used here rejects Gunkel's excessive dependence on his evolutionary view of traditions and history.

[5] Allowance is made for laws, treaties, certain cultic materials, etc. to have been preserved in written form.

Pre-Yahwistic Literary Form

The narrative form in which most of the Jacob tradition has been preserved lends itself readily to alteration, shaping, and theologizing because prose narrative is exposed to the danger of being distorted by recital much more than poetic forms. Transmission would be more faithful where every deviation is a source of danger; in prayers and ritual texts the correct wording sometimes determined how the deity received the prayers.

The narrative form of the pre-Yahwistic Jacob tradition contributes very little to the understanding of its origin and development. When the genre or category of subject matter is considered, some confusion in terminology is apparent. S. H. Hooke labels the Jacob tradition a "saga" which contains "cult legends." He defines saga as having no connection with ritual or religion and ". . . is primarily a story, transmitted orally from generation to generation, preserving traditions of the wanderings and adventures of clans or tribes, or of the exploits of tribal heroes."[7] Cult legends, in contrast to saga, are from the first of religious origin.[8] The cycle of stories about Jacob is often called a saga or a saga cluster,[9] but Gunkel used the term "legend" to refer to the Jacob cycle, as well as its individual elements.[10] The point at issue is whether the traditions have a setting in the cult; therefore, this study will use saga as non-cultic and legend as cultic.[11]

---

[6] James Muilenburg, "Literary Forms: Old Testament Forms," A Companion to the Bible, 2nd ed., ed. by H. H. Rowley, p. 123.

The pre-Yahwistic Jacob tradition is neither wholly saga, nor is it wholly legend. When reference is made to all the Jacob stories, "the Jacob tradition" is used, and when a distinction is desired between cultic and non-cultic material, the terms saga and legend are used.

---

[7] "Genesis," Peake's Commentary on the Bible, ed. by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley, p. 186.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Cf. Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 34, 38-47; Fohrer, Introduction, pp. 86, 90-93; Weiser, Old Testament, pp. 59-62; Gerhard von Rad, Genesis: A Commentary, trans. by John H. Marks, pp. 13-19, 31-36 (hereafter, von Rad, Genesis).

[10] The Legend of Genesis, trans. by W. H. Carruth; cf. Kuhl, Old Testament, pp. 42-44. Sigmund Mowinckel, The Old Testament as Word of God, trans. by Reidar B. Bjornard, pp. 90-99, used the terms "sacred" and "secular legend."

[11] This terminology follows the pattern of S. H. Hooke, loc. cit.

Pre-Yahwistic Structure

If particular types of speech are conducive to certain situations in the life of a people, the social and cultural situation reflected in the Jacob tradition will show the basic development of the Jacob tradition as a whole. Whether the individual narrative units are related to larger complexes shows whether or not the narrative unit is independent.[12] Here the concern is the sequence and movement of events, delays and climaxes in the plot, themes and concepts that are maintained and emphasized, and historical presuppositions exhibited by persons and events. The probable setting for the pre-Yahwistic Jacob tradition can be evaluated by examining the biblical sources in light of any comparative evidence which sheds light on the period in which the Jacob tradition is set in the biblical sources.

Nomadic Stories

The biblical sources present Jacob as a princely shepherd who migrated over vast areas of Palestine, Syria, and Egypt. The action and movement of the plot encompasses tribal conflicts, disputes over water and grazing rights, and migrations in flight from enemies and in search of food. The Jacob figure displays unusual knowledge of sheep raising and was blessed with fertility and prosperity. A deity directed the path of Jacob, bestowed unusual skills and powers upon him, and took an active interest in the welfare of Jacob and his family.

---

[12] Cf. Otto Eissfeldt, "The Smallest Literary Unit in the Narrative Books of the Old Testament," Old Testament Essays, ed. by D. C. Simpson, pp. 85-93.

Worship in the Jacob narratives was simple and individual; it was more of a relation between man and God than it was a matter of forms and ceremonies. Prayers and sacrifices were its known forms of expression.[13] God's intervention in the affairs of Jacob consisted of divine guidance, blessings, and curses.

The kind of stories that would likely thrive in such conditions are campfire stories about successful warriors, skilled sheep-breeders, and religious figures who exhibited unusual powers and information. These nomadic stories were the common property of the shepherd culture and circulated among the various groups as independent units of traditions.[14] These shepherd traditions were attracted to an unusually successful leader of the shepherd groups. Such a leader could have been a good warrior or an unusual religious figure, or he could have been a combination of shepherd, warrior, and religious figure.

---

[13] Cf. H. H. Rowley, Worship in Ancient Israel, pp. 34-36.

[14] Cf. von Rad, "History and the Patriarchs," ET, LXXII:214, 1960-61.

The date of these campfire stories cannot be ascertained with any degree of accuracy, since nomadic stories are neither older nor younger than legends associated with cultic centers. In fact, these saga-type stories could have existed side by side with cultic legends in some cultural situations, e.g., when a more sedentary culture finds itself in a migratory situation, or vice versa.

Cultic Legends

The Jacob tradition is associated with a number of important cultic sites in Palestine; thus, the cultic legend will have an important role in the Jacob tradition. Cultic legends were connected with holy places in order to explain the origin or basis of the sacredness of the place together with the customs and beliefs which were practiced at the cultic site. These legends related how the numen which inhabited the sacred shrine had revealed himself and how the numen had opened the worshipper's eyes by means of the revelation so that the holiness of the place is recognized and so that the worshipper knows that the numen desired to be worshipped there in the future.[15] Although all of the ancient sanctuaries had such legends told about them, the origins of many of the cultic centers remain shrouded in the shadows of antiquity, and only traces of the cultic legends are extant.

---

[15] Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 42-43. For a thorough treatment of the subject of aetiological legends, consult Burke O. Long, The Problem of Etiological Narrative in the Old Testament, "Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft," Heft 108.

Many of the cultic shrines to which the Jacob tradition is attached were once Canaanite holy places. Eissfeldt states that Bethel, Gilgal, Shechem, and some other sanctuaries were definitely Canaanite shrines before they became Israelite and that the Israelites borrowed some of the cultic legends and rituals of some of these sanctuaries by putting the Israelite Yahweh in the place of the Canaanite numen who originally appeared in the story. "In some cases this can even be demonstrated in the actual wording of the story, or may at least be seen to be probable."[16]

Cycle of Tradition

A cycle of tradition, or "saga cluster,"[17] is found in the collection of Jacob stories. Disagreement may arise as to the nature and size of the collection into larger units, but the possibility of individual stories being combined into larger units is suggested by the inner unity of the plot and movement of the Jacob stories in the Genesis narratives.

---

[16] Ibid., p. 43.

[17] Von Rad, Genesis, p. 21.

In contrast to the Abraham cycle (Gen. 12-25), which is essentially a collection of independent narratives that are loosely held together by the theological motif of promise, the Jacob cycle manifests a clearer and more compact unity which is achieved by a two-scene conflict between Jacob and Esau (Gen. 25-27; 29-33).[18] Conflict eventuates into flight (Gen. 25-27); achievement of prosperity by blessing returns Jacob to the area from which he fled (Gen. 29-33).[19]

If a unity of theme is present in the pre-Yahwistic Jacob tradition, the problem of defining the unity and its setting in the history of Israel is not easy. Claus Westermann has suggested that the attainment of blessing (Gen. 25-28; 32-35) and its effect (Gen. 29-31) explains the unity of structure in the Jacob narratives.[20] A theme of blessing clearly is integral to the Jacob tradition, but what stage in the compilation of the Jacob cycle of tradition the theme of blessing represents is not certain. The literary type which pronounces blessings and curses is a common feature of extra-biblical literature before, during, and after the time Jacob was supposed to have lived.[21] Hittite law codes which date in the third millenium B.C. have blessing and curse formulae attached to them.[22] The blessings and curses consisted of a list of goods and calamities which the divine witnesses of the suzerainty treaty were called upon to bring upon the vassal for obedience and disobedience respectively. The blessings took the form of divine protection, continuity of the vassal's descendants, his health, prosperity, and peace.[23] How strongly the theme of blessing can be stressed as a unifying theme will have to be determined after a thorough examination of the Jacob narratives has been carried out.

---

[18] Cf. Claus Westermann, Handbook to the Old Testament, trans. by Robert H. Boyd, pp. 29-30, 40-42 (hereafter, Westermann, Handbook), who includes Genesis 35:1-15 (P) in this cycle.

[19] Julian Morgenstern, The Book of Genesis, 2nd ed., pp. 188-89, has noted that unity of theme in the Jacob stories is supplemented by a highly dramatic technique. Each scene moves to the next with a sense of expectation, suspense, and unrelieved tension. Hardly a single scene could be told by itself and still make sense. Although a dramatic technique is observable, Morgenstern has overstated his case.

[20] *Op. cit.*, p. 41.

A geographical clustering of traditions should not be overlooked in the Jacob stories. A sharp cleavage between East-Jordan[24] and West-Jordan traditions about Jacob is quite apparent. Certain persons, events, and sanctuaries have a strong attraction for the East-Jordan area, while other events and persons cluster around certain West-Jordan sites. A geographical clustering of tradition would probably reflect fraternal relations between groups or cultures and could point to the origin of elements of the Jacob cycle of tradition.

---

[21] Cf. F. C. Fensham, "Malediction and Benediction in the Ancient Near Eastern Vassal Treaties and the Old Testament," ZAW, 74:1-9, 1962.

[22] G. E. Mendenhall, "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition," BA, XVII:60, 1954.

[23] _Idem_, "Covenant," IDB, Vol. A-D, p. 714.

[24] The term "East-Jordan" in this study will also include Syria, Mesopotamia, and the North-west Semitic area in general.

Historical Credo

The biblical sources maintain that Israel had certain holy places which served as cultic centers in the period of the Conquest and Judges (cf. Josh. 24, etc.). Sacred feasts at these sanctuaries offered occasion for the most important events of the group's history to be celebrated. On such occasions the congregation witnessed to its faith in their deliverance from Egypt, the enactment of a covenant relationship with Yahweh, and God's choice of a people to be his own people. These confessional creeds were a vital part of the cultic ceremonies of the pre-Yahwistic worship.[25] Traces of such "creedal"[26] statements have been preserved in Joshua 24 and Deuteronomy 26:5ff. (cf. Deut. 20:6ff.), while allusions to Jacob are a prominent feature of both these passages.

---

[25] Cf. Klaus Koch, The Book of Books, trans. by Margaret Kohl, pp. 21-22.

[26] The nature of the recital of such material is discussed by Gerhard von Rad, "The Problem of the Hexateuch," The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, trans. by E. W. Trueman Dicken, pp. 1-78, esp. pp. 3-8, 41-48 (hereafter, von Rad, "Problem of the Hexateuch"). Cf.

Behind these historical credos is posited a sacral act of the union of the tribes into a tribal league.[27] The participation of the tribes in the tribal confederacy was encouraged by the enactment of a covenant relationship with a common God.

A tribal league, no matter what its precise nature was,[28] would provide a strong motive for unifying or developing traditions that expressed a common bond among the participating tribes. Within a tribal league common ancestors, a covenantal faith, a Supreme Overlord, and a central sanctuary would be expected. The rituals and hymns in such

---

E. W. Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition, pp. 40-49; also see Weiser, Old Testament, pp. 81-99, who is critical of von Rad.

[27] Murray Newman, The People of the Covenant, pp. 102-26. Cf. Martin Noth, Das System der zwölf Stamme Israels, "Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament," Vierte Folge, Heft 1, pp. 1-121; Albrecht Alt, "Formation of the State in Palestine," Essays on Old Testament History and Religion, trans. by R. A. Wilson, pp. 179-80; Eduard Nielsen, Shechem: A Traditio-Historical Investigation, 2nd ed., pp. 86-141.

[28] Artur Weiser, The Psalms, trans. by Herbert Hartwell, pp. 23-35, described it as an occasion of renewal of the Covenant. Cf. Martin Noth, The History of Israel, 2nd ed., trans. by Peter R. Ackroyd, pp. 85-97 (hereafter, Noth, History); John Bright, A History of Israel, pp. 142-51 (hereafter, Bright, History).

a tribal league would provide an ideal occasion to emphasize these common bonds of unity. If Weiser is correct when he maintains that the saving deeds of Yahweh and the content of the covenantal salvation can be summarized in classic formulations and abbreviated creeds which are expressed in stylized formulae,[29] the allusions to Jacob could have set off a memory pattern of the Jacob tradition. A study of the references to Jacob which are associated with the tribal league should throw light on an important stage in the development of the Jacob tradition.

B. THE JACOB TRADITION AND THE TRIBAL LEAGUE

In the preceding section the formative potential which the tribal league had on the Jacob tradition was noted, but the study of Jacob's relationship to the tribal league is burdened with all the problems associated with the "Conquest and Settlement" of Palestine. Recent scholarship has proposed various reconstructions of the history of the Conquest and Settlement of the Israelite tribes in Palestine which is reported in Joshua and Judges. The school headed by Albright insists that a Conquest can be reconstructed from archaeological data just as the biblical sources generally report;[30] however, Albright's students have independent positions on various aspects of these problems. Noth, in contrast to Albright, concludes that Israel was organized into a twelve-tribe league only after independent tribes had settled in Palestine; no "Conquest" occurred exactly as the biblical sources suggest.[31] Neither of these reconstructions relieves all of the ambiguities.

---

[29] Weiser, *ibid*., pp. 74-75.

G. E. Mendenhall[32] has proposed a theory of the Settlement of the tribes in Palestine which is the best synthesis of the material that has yet been presented. In short, he claims that "a peasant's revolt" against the monarchy and aristocracy of the Canaanite city-states by a process of "withdrawal" from society best described the "Israelite" Settlement of Palestine. These displaced groups lived on the desert fringes until they later united to overthrow the rule of the Canaanite city-states. The rallying point for these various groups was the acceptance of Yahweh, whom a group of Egyptian slaves had encountered in their liberation. The word "Conquest" does not describe the formation of Israel in Palestine, for no mass immigration nor sweeping blitz occurred.

---

[30] Cf. W. F. Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity, 2nd ed., "Doubleday Anchor Books," pp. 273-81.

[31] Cf. Noth, History, pp. 68-84.

[32] "The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine," BA, XXV:66-86, 1962.

Although Mendenhall's theory is problematical, it best explains the relation of "Israel" to the resident Canaanites at the beginning of the "Israelite period." Some military activity was involved in Israel's establishment of authority in central Palestine, but the Settlement was the result of small skirmishes over a long period of time.

The connection of the Jacob tradition with such a reconstruction of the history of the Conquest and Settlement is just as theoretical as the reconstruction of history upon which it depends. The history recorded in the biblical sources must be reconstructed before one can locate the passages in which the Jacob tradition appears. Then the circle which preserved the tradition can be examined. Also the developmental factors which have shaped and altered the Jacob tradition can be studied with profit. Joshua 24 and Deuteronomy 26 figure prominently in the reconstruction of the history of the Settlement of the tribes in Palestine. Fortunately the Jacob tradition also appears in these crucial passages. A literary analysis of these sources must precede a study of the Jacob tradition which is contained in the sources.

Joshua 24

The complexity of the sources of the book of Joshua almost defies analysis. Bright states that it presents as complex a literary problem as any book in the Bible.[33] The Septuagint varies considerably from the Massoretic text and Nielsen argues convincingly that the Septuagint of Joshua 24:5-13 preserves an independent text tradition which is superior to the Massoretic text.[34] The Septuagint text locates the covenant ceremony at Shiloh instead of Shechem (Josh. 24:1), and H. M. Orlinsky maintains that the Septuagint readings are "authentic variants in different Hebrew text-traditions."[35] Thus, the Septuagint text must be taken seriously, even though the readings are precarious.

James Muilenburg makes a strong case for seeing in Joshua 24 a formal structure which conforms closely, but not exactly, to the form of the Hittite vassal-treaties of the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries B.C. Since the outline of the covenant-sacrament pattern in Joshua 24 is very close to the original form, Muilenburg argues that Joshua 24 is a precis or abridgement of what was once a much more elaborate and coherent account.[36] The covenantal form pattern witnesses to an internal unity that could date very near the actual covenant occasion. The literary form also indicates that alteration of an older covenant or formulation of a new covenant is very basic to the Sitz im Leben of this passage.

---

[33] "The Book of Joshua: Introduction and Exegesis," IB, Vol. 2, p. 542. Cf. Nielsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 86-110, for detailed critical notes on the textual problems of Joshua 24:1-28. Also see Horst Seebass, *Der Erzvater Israel und die Einführung der Jahweverehrung in Kanaan*, pp. 5-8.

[34] Nielsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 88-90.

[35] Quoted by G. E. Wright, *Shechem*, p. 256, n. 19. Orlinsky drew this conclusion from a critical study of the text at the request of Wright.

That the nucleus of Joshua 24 has been expanded by later glosses and elaborations is obvious, but the nature of these redactions has eluded critics. Noth has almost convinced Old Testament scholars that Joshua belongs to a block of material (Josh.--II Kgs.) that has been written in deuteronomistic style.[37] However, Joshua 24, which seems to show an Elohistic provenance of its Grundlage, probably was appended to the original book of Joshua by a deuteronomic redactor who drew upon traditions from the pentateuchal sources (J, E, and P).[38] Mendenhall correctly draws attention to the difficulty of escaping the conclusion that Joshua 24 rests upon traditions which go back to the period when the treaty form was still living; the later writer used the traditions which were of importance to him and adapted them to his own situation.[39] Nielsen cautiously suggests that behind the present ritual and redactions of Joshua 24 are the following pre-deuteronomic features: the name of the Lord ("Yahweh the God of Israel"), the dwelling place of the ancestors beyond the river, their worship of other gods, the Egyptian sojourn, the Septuagint version of Joshua 24:5-13, the deliverance from Egypt, and the conquest of the land of the Amorites.[40] C. H. Giblin notes that the cumulative evidence of numerical patterns in Joshua 24 suggests its basic unity; these patterns also serve as a check on the tendency to eliminate more and more of the text as secondary.[41]

---

[36] "The Form and Structure of Covenantal Formulations," VT, IX:357-60, 1959. For treatment of Hittite parallels to Israelite covenant forms, see G. E. Mendenhall, "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition," BA, XVII:50-76, 1954. See also D. J. McCarthy, "Covenant in the Old Testament," CBQ, 27:225-32, 1965.

[37] Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, 2nd ed., pp. 1-27.

[38] Muilenburg, op. cit., p. 357. Cf. Otto Eissfeldt, Hexateuch-Synopse, pp. 248-50. Fohrer, Introduction, pp. 201-02, maintained that Joshua 24 appears to contain an ancient saga which goes back to a tribal narrative in which a historical background presupposes the figure of Jacob.

In Joshua 24:4 the Jacob tradition has been placed in a section of the covenant form which recites the gracious acts of God (Josh. 24:2-13). Jacob and Esau are given to Isaac; the land of Seir (Edom) was given to Esau for him to possess, and Jacob and his sons went down to Egypt (Josh. 24:4). The explanation of the existence of Esau in Edom does not reveal any particular hostility toward Edom as was true in Judah after the period of David. Edom and Israel formed an alliance against Judah during the reign of Ahaz (II Kgs. 16:16), and Edom won its independence from Judah.[42] Placing Jacob and his sons in Egypt may be an attempt to associate the house of Joseph with the tribal union at Shechem. Behind the present sources is a union of West-Jordan tribes of the Central Highlands with the East-Jordan tribes (Manasseh and a Canaanite "Israel" group?). Mendenhall's theory of the Conquest would allow such a suggestion, but the sources of Joshua 24 are too complex to lend much support.[43]

---

[39] Mendenhall, op. cit., p. 67.

[40] Nielsen, op. cit., p. 98. Vide supra, n. 24.

[41] "Structural Patterns in Josh. 24, 1-25," CBQ, XXVI:50-69, 1964.

The Jacob tradition also appears among a group of grave traditions (Josh. 24:32), and grave traditions usually give valuable information about the area of activity of the persons involved. Two of these grave traditions are about historical persons (Joshua and Eleazar), but the third concerns an ancestor of the sons of Joseph.[44] The common denominator of these three traditions is that they were associated with the house of Joseph. Joshua was buried in his own inheritance at Timnath-serah in the hill country of Ephraim. Joshua was the leader of the Ephraimites and played the principal role in uniting the house of Joseph (cf. Josh. 10:1-15).[45] Eleazar was a northern priest who was buried in the hill country of Ephraim. The bones of Joseph were brought to a burial ground which Jacob had purchased from the sons of Hamor (cf. Gen. 33:19; 50:25; Ex. 13:19).[46] Kenyon has found Middle Bronze Age tombs at Jericho in which the disarticulated bones were deposited in some sort of fiber container and tossed into the tomb. The bodies of those who had died during the course of the seasonal migrations of the tribe were transported to a tribal burial ground.[47] However, the text does not imply that the Josephites had wandered from their homeland on a seasonal migration. This very old burial custom would be appropriate for the pre-Settlement wanderings of the shepherd-tribes of Israel.

---

[42] Cf. ANET, p. 282, where it is recorded that the king of Edom paid tribute to Tiglath-pileser III at Damascus.

[43] Cf. G. E. Mendenhall, "The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine," BA, XXV:66-87, 1962.

[44] Nielsen, _op_. _cit_., p. 138.

---

[45] Ibid., pp. 139-40; T. J. Meek, Hebrew Origins, "Harper Torchbook," ed., pp. vii-viii; Martin Noth, Das Buch Josua, zweite Auflage, pp. 107-108.

[46] LXX has "Amorites" instead of Hamor. R. E. Clements, "Baal-Berith of Shechem," JSS, XIII:21-31, 1968, suggested that "sons of Hamor" were leaders of the city and executors of the covenant between Baal-Berith and themselves. G. E. Wright, Shechem, pp. 130-31, identified "sons of Hamor" as members of a confederation which had been sealed by the rite of killing an ass, since Hamor in Hebrew means "ass, donkey."

[47] Kathleen M. Kenyon, Archaeology in the Holy Land, 2nd ed., p. 139.

The reason for the transfer of the bones of Joseph is an attempt to connect the "inheritance of the descendants of Joseph" with traditions that were localized at Shechem. Jacob is well established at Shechem (cf. Gen. 33:18ff.; 35:4; 37:12-14); the tradition persisted in the northern kingdom until the New Testament era (cf. John 4:12). Acts 7:15-16 recalls a tradition which has Jacob buried at Shechem, contrary to the P source which places his burial at Machpelah (Gen. 50:13). Joshua 24:32 establishes the right of the descendants of Joseph to a burial ground at Shechem by connecting Joseph with Jacob. Genesis 48:22 (E) pictures Jacob giving to Joseph Shechem (literally, "a shoulder" MT) which Jacob had acquired by battle with the Amorites. In the Septuagint of Joshua 24:32 Jacob "gave to Joseph" the plot of ground at Shechem for an inheritance, but the Septuagint follows the Massoretic text to the extent that Jacob purchased (cf. Gen. 33:19) the land from the Amorites (MT, "Hamor") instead of acquiring it by battle.[48] The Septuagint of Joshua 24:32 has the support of Genesis 48:22 and presents the more realistic acquisition of burial rights at Shechem by Jacob. Nielsen is correct when he suggests that behind this deuteronomized and ritual tradition one can trace a narrative of what happened *once*, the concluding of an alliance between the Ephraimites and the central part of "Israel," Machir, and/or Manasseh. He regards Joshua 24 ultimately as a source of information of the origin of the house of Joseph.[49] Joshua 24 is not an account of the origin of the house of Joseph, but is an account of an alliance involving Josephites.

---

[48] _Vide supra_, n. 46.

The Septuagint version may preserve an ancient fragment of tradition when it refers to Israel picking up the "ark of God" (Josh. 24:33-LXX) and carrying it about with them. The Ark of the Covenant had come from Shittim in East-Jordan (Josh 3:3ff.) and was destined for Gilgal in West-Jordan (Josh. 4:19-20). The controversy which arose over the great altar which Reuben, Gad, and Manasseh had built near the Jordan (Josh. 22:10) has a closer connection with Joshua 24 than is apparent from the present Massoretic text. The controversy centered around allegiance to Yahweh; the East-Jordan tribes had acclaimed El of the gods as Yahweh (אֵל אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה). Some from East-Jordan feared a day when the worship of Yahweh would be restricted to West-Jordan (Josh. 22:24-25). The East-Jordan altar was to serve as a memorial to descendants of both sides that a covenant had been effected between the East-Jordan and West-Jordan tribes (Josh. 22:28). If the Septuagint reading of Joshua 22:10 is accepted (Israel came to "Gilgal of the Jordan"), a controversy between East-Jordan and West-Jordan tribes of the house of Joseph lies behind the complex sources of Joshua 22 and 24.[50] Interestingly, the Septuagint reading of Joshua 24:30 recalls some cultic fixtures at Gilgal that were associated with the circumcision of Israel at Gilgal (cf. Josh. 5:2ff.; also Josh. 21:42-LXX). Judges 2:1, 7ff. is independent evidence that Gilgal has some connection with the traditions that lie behind Joshua 24, since the burial tradition of Joshua 24:29 is quoted in Judges 2:8.[51]

---

[49] Nielsen, *op*. *cit*., p. 140.

If Joshua 24 does preserve traditions of an alliance between East and West-Jordan tribes, the localizing of the Jacob tradition at Shechem may very well be preceded by its existence in the traditions of the groups which formed this primitive alliance between East and West-Jordan Josephites. Thus, the account of the assembly at Shechem (Josh. 24:1) is an extension of the covenantal relationship with Yahweh to include the twelve tribes as a whole.[52] The nature of this alliance was the transfer of the cult of El Elohe Israel to Yahweh Elohe Israel (cf. Gen. 33:20).[53] Joshua 24 implies that the patriarchs worshipped other gods when they lived beyond the River (Josh. 24:2b, 14-16). Could the patriarch of the primitive cult of Shechem have been Israel, since the name Israel is so prominent and integral in the cult?[54] The Shechem cult will be examined as a sanctuary of the Jacob tradition in a succeeding section of this study.

---

[50] Cf. H. J. Kraus, Worship in Israel, trans. by Geoffrey Buswell, p. 158, who suggested that a "cultic intercourse" between Gilgal and the East-Jordan altar of Joshua 22:10 may have occurred.

[51] Martin Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch, p. 55, n. 170, opposed localizing the Conquest tradition at Gilgal.

Deuteronomy 26:5-11

Set within the ritual for the Feast of Weeks[55] (cf. Deut. 16:9-12) is a creedal-type recital of two of God's mighty acts (Deut. 26:5-11): Settlement in a land which had been promised to Israel's forefathers and deliverance from Egypt in the Exodus. This creedal form no doubt had a place in the cult of the settled tribes from the very beginning of their worship at sanctuaries. Although the present text of Deuteronomy 26:5-11 has an unmistakably deuteronomic phraseology, earlier traditions were utilized by the Deuteronomist.[56] Of the five themes which Noth maintains are the structural foundations of the Pentateuch,[57] only the Sinai theme is absent from Deuteronomy 26:5-11.[58] Whether the revision of the text was a literary interpolation or a preliterary combination of traditions cannot be decided, but that the creedal statements which are recited here would be appropriate in the context of the tribal league must remain as a workable hypothesis.

---

[52] Kraus, op. cit., p. 136.

[53] Horst Seebass, Der Erzvater Israel und die Einführung der Jahweverehung in Kanaan, pp. 7-8, 11, contended that a previous stage of Joshua 24 was the transfer of the cult of El Elohe Israel to Yahweh Elohe Israel. Both Abraham (Josh. 24:2, 3) and the cult of Yahweh were imposed upon a cult which had existed at Shechem at a much earlier time.

[54] Cf. ibid., p. 11.

[55] Kraus, op. cit., pp. 55-61.

---

[56] Von Rad, "Problem of the Hexateuch," pp. 41-48, insisted that Deuteronomy 26:5-10 was the "festival legend" of the Feast of Weeks, which once belonged to an autumn festival at Gilgal at which traditions of the Conquest were celebrated. *Contra* von Rad, cf. Weiser, *Old Testament*, pp. 81-99; Fohrer, *Introduction*, pp. 117-19, 1965; Herbert B. Huffmon, "The Exodus, Sinai and the Credo," CBQ, XXVII:101-13; T. C. Vriezen, *The Religion of Ancient Israel*, trans. by Hubert Hoskins, pp. 126-29; Walter Beyerlin, *Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions*, trans. by S. Rudman, pp. 145-46, 167-70; E. W. Nicholson, *Deuteronomy and Tradition*, pp. 40-46; Murray Newman, *The People of the Covenant*, pp. 20-22; John Bright, *Early Israel in Recent History Writing*, "Studies in Biblical Theology," No. 19, pp. 41-42, 51-55, 104-10.

[57] Martin Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*, pp. 48-67. Noth claimed that the Pentateuch was structured around five themes: Exodus from Egypt, entry into Palestine, promise to patriarchs, guidance in wilderness, and revelation at Sinai. Deuteronomy 26:5-11 was the earliest expression of these themes, around which the entire Pentateuch was formed. Both Noth and von Rad, *loc. cit.*, separate the Exodus from the Conquest traditions.

[58] G. E. Wright, "Deuteronomy: Introduction and Exegesis," IB, Vol. 2, p. 483, stated that the confession in vv. 5b-10a shows no clear marks of the deuteronomic style and is "almost certainly quoted from an older source." Leonhard Rost, "Das kleine geschichtliche Credo," *Das kleine Credo und andere Studien zum alten Testament*, pp. 11-25, dated the formulation of this text no earlier than Josiah's reform.

The introductory formula to Deuteronomy 26:5-11 states that the father of the tribes who were addressed was an Aramean. In the period of the Judges (*ca*. 1225-1020 B.C.) Arameans were concentrated around the sources of the Jordan River, and small Aramean states lined the northern and northeastern borders of the land claimed by the Israelite tribes. The Arameans probably originated from the Northwest-Semitic peoples of Upper Mesopotamia and Syria[59] and seem to have formed a part of mass migrations of nomadic groups that moved along borders of the Syrian desert to and from Egypt and along the Euphrates River during the patriarchal era and especially during the Amarna Age. The Arameans are also called Amorites, *Sutû*, and Ahlame.[60]

In the biblical traditions Nahor and his descendants (Abraham, Lot, Bethuel, and Laban) were connected with the Aramean city of Haran (Gen. 22:20-24; 24:4, 7, 10; 25:20; 28:2 in MT). Abraham migrated from Haran to Syria and

---

[59] English translations follow LXX in translating ארם as "Syria."

[60] R. A. Bowman, "Arameans," IDB, Vol. A-D, pp. 190-93; *idem*, "Arameans, Aramaic, and the Bible," JNES, VII:65-90, 1948; Richard D. Barnett, "Arameans," *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1966 ed.), Vol. 2, pp. 207-208.

Canaan (Gen. 12:4-5), and he obtained Rebekah for Isaac from Haran (Gen. 24). Jacob fled to Laban, an Aramean (Gen. 25:20; 28:1-7; 31:20, 24), from whom he obtained Rachel and Leah as wives. Beek has asked whether Jacob or Abraham is meant by the reference to "the wandering Aramean" (Deut. 26:5), because Abraham was called a Hebrew (Gen. 14:13) and was said to have come from Ur of the Chaldeans (Gen. 11:28, 31; 15:7; Neh. 9:7).[61] However, the term "Hebrew" may also apply to other ethnic groups of wandering warriors of mixed origin and occupation, if the equation of Hebrew and Habiru and the Egyptian 'Apiru is accepted.[62] Also "Chaldean" as a place name for Ur is anachronistic in every occurrence. Both Jacob and Abraham took journeys to Egypt, but only the house of Jacob-Israel remained there where they became a great people (Deut. 26:5b). When Deuteronomy 26:1-11 is understood without regard to Genesis, only the father Israel could be meant since it is the sons of Israel that are addressed in the law codes of Deuteronomy. Jacob, and not Abraham, is also called Israel.[63] Thus, the usual interpretation of Jacob as the Aramean is well-founded.[64]

---

[61] M. A. Beek, "Das Problem des Aramäischen Stamenvaters," Oudtestamentische Studiën, Vol. VIII, pp. 202-205, 211.

[62] On the identification of Habiru, see Kathleen M. Kenyon, Archaeology in the Holy Land, 2nd ed., pp. 182-85.

Jacob is here styled as a "wandering" (RSV) Aramean. The Hebrew word in question is a Qal participle from the root אָבַד, "to perish." Overwhelmingly in the Old Testament it means "perish" (78 times).[65] When applied to animals the word can mean "be lost" or "go astray." Property and things can "perish" or "be lost" (אֹבֵד).[66] A "perishing" Aramean has reference to migrations of people in search of food, water, and safety in time of drought, plague, or war.[67] Shepherds would be in constant danger of perishing (אֹבֵד), and thus "perish" here describes a homeless, wandering type of life which was characteristic of Israel's nomadic ancestors. The Septuagint has tried to improve the Massoretic text by making אֹבֵד as transitive: "My father *rejected* a Syrian," while the Targum has: "The Aramean *sought to destroy* my father," and the pre-Talmudic Midrash (the *Sifre* on Deut.) regards the verb as transitive. The present Passover liturgy has "The Aramean *was destroying* my father."[68] These translations have made the same mistake that Seebass made when he considered אֹבֵד as in parallel structure to the verbs which express the Egyptian oppression in Deuteronomy 26:6.[69] The Deuteronomist has selected traditions which emphasize God's gracious gift of the land in which Israel resided. No less than four times does the present text state the God had given them the land (Deut. 26:1, 2, 3, 9).[70]

---

[63] Seebass, *op*. *cit*., pp. 9-11.

[64] Cf. e.g., von Rad, *Deuteronomy*: *A Commentary*, trans. by Dorothea Barton, pp. 157-59 (hereafter, von Rad, *Deuteronomy*); Wright, *op*. *cit*., p. 484; G. A. Danell, *Studies in the Name of Israel*, p. 34n; Nielsen, *Shechem*: *A Traditio-Historical Investigation*, p. 88, 94; Noth, *History*, p. 125.

[65] Seebass, *op*. *cit*., p. 4. Cf. Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner (eds.), *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*, pp. 2-3; Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs (eds.), *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, pp. 1-2 (hereafter, BDB).

[66] Koehler and Baumgartner, *ibid*.

[67] *Contra* Seebass, *loc*. *cit*., who interpreted אֹבֵד as "one threatened with ruin or destruction," i.e., "in danger of perishing."

Consequently, the Jacob tradition is connected with a sojourn in Egypt to fuse these three traditions: promise to patriarchs, Exodus, and Settlement. The Settlement had prior association with the promise, i.e., fulfillment of the promise. Possibly Jacob, too, had an earlier association with Gilgal, as did the Settlement.[71] But Jacob is connected with the Exodus in an indirect way by his association with Joseph. In the Joseph narratives of Genesis (Gen. 37-50) Jacob seems to have been placed in Egypt primarily to bless the two tribes of the house of Joseph (Gen. 48).

---

[68] R. A. Bowman, "Arameans, Aramaic, and the Bible," JNES, VII:68n., 1948.

[69] Cf. Seebass, *loc. cit.*

[70] Cf. James Muilenburg, "Form Criticism and Beyond," JBL, LXXXVIII:16-17, 1969.

[71] Gerhard von Rad, "The Promised Land and Yahweh's Land in the Hexateuch," *The Problem of the Hexateuch and*

Therefore, that the reference to a wandering Aramean being an ancestor of Israel was once an independent tradition which referred to the Jacob tradition is not improbable. The use of this tradition probably is the result of combining traditions to achieve closer ties within a tribal league.

Conclusion

Both Joshua 24 and Deuteronomy imply that the Jacob tradition was preserved by the Josephite tribes during the Settlement period. The extent of the Jacob tradition during this period is quite fragmentary because of the complex nature of the sources involved.[72] The geographical locale of

---

Other Essays, trans. by E. W. Trueman Dicken, pp. 79-93, connected the Settlement traditions with the promise to the patriarchs; however, he would consider this a late theological reflection. In a whole series of compositions the narrative begins with the patriarchal period, but omits the Sinai episode (cf. Deut. 26:5ff.; Josh. 24:2ff.; I Sam. 12:8; Psalm 105). Cf. von Rad, "Problem of the Hexateuch," p. 55.

[72] Von Rad, Deuteronomy, p. 159, suggested that Deuteronomy 26:5 might contain the vestige of a tradition considerably different from that in the present pentateuchal sources.

the Jacob tradition is similar to the locale of the Settlement traditions, i.e., Gilgal and possibly East-Jordan. The deuteronomic version of these traditions is localized at Shechem in Joshua 24 and Deuteronomy 26. Especially does Joshua 24 imply that the Jacob tradition had a place in an alliance involving the Josephite tribes, although a twelve-tribe amphictyony of the Joseph tribes i~~n~~s unlikely.[73]

The historical reconstruction of Mendenhall would place the Jacob tradition in East-Jordan immediately preceding the Settlement; during the Settlement the Jacob tradition becomes associated with Shechem. The connection with Shechem is the result of a fusion of the Joseph tribes with a group of El worshippers at Shechem.

C. HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF BRONZE AGE JACOB

The sources that bridge the historical gap between the patriarchal period and the Settlement are too complex to be of significant use in a study of the Jacob tradition during this period. References to the Jacob tradition outside the Genesis narratives are relatively scarce and are unconcerned with the period prior to the Settlement. The situations presupposed in these references to the Jacob tradition outside Genesis date during and after the United Monarchy.

---

[73] T. J. Meek, Hebrew Origins, "Harper Torchbook" ed., p. 26, believed Joshua organized an amphictyony at Shechem which was only for Joseph tribes. Cf. G. A. Danell, Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament, p. 46.

Therefore, a Sitz im Leben for the Jacob tradition during the Middle and Late Bronze Ages must be reconstructed from Genesis and from comparative evidence; the history and culture presupposed in the biblical sources must be weighed against the parallels from comparative sources. If no comparative material applies, then a theoretical reconstruction may prove helpful.

The Bronze Age World of Jacob

A brief survey of the world in which the earliest form of the Jacob tradition is set will serve as the comparative data for a study of the Bronze Age background of the Jacob tradition.

Jacob and the Merneptah Stele

The earliest extra-biblical reference to the name Israel is found in a victory song of the Egyptian king, Merneptah (ca. 1230 B.C.), over the Libyans.[74] This stele has been used as evidence that a people called Israel existed in the vicinity of Palestine about 1230 B.C., but whether they were considered as already settled depends upon the interpretation of the determinative of "Israel."[75] Because the primary interest in the Merneptah Stele has been to confirm the date of the Exodus and Conquest, the real meaning of this reference to Israel has been obscured.[76] The statement that the offspring of Israel had been completely destroyed ("his seed is not") is usually explained as a boast of power by the Egyptians and not historical fact. On this statement G. E. Wright has hypothesized, "Of course, the latter was indulging in hyperbole for propaganda purposes . . . , for subsequent events proved that Israel was far from desolate and without offspring."[77] The presupposition of this interpretation is that the Israel of the Merneptah Stele and the Israel of the Exodus experience were identical, but this presupposition takes a lot for granted.

---

[74] ANE, p. 231.

However, the option should remain open to explain what the destruction of a Canaanite people called Israel would mean if the Merneptah Stele is historical as the two other records of the Libyan victory are accepted as historical.[78] If the Israel of the Merneptah Stele was a part of the Habiru bands who are mentioned in the Amarna Letters (ca., 1390-1365 B.C.) and who posed a threat to Shechem and Jerusalem,[79] the destruction of Israel by Egypt would mean the break-up of the influence of the Canaanite group called Israel which existed around Shechem. Those Israelites who escaped the destruction of Israel by Egypt by fleeing to the hill country of Ephraim and East-Jordan joined in an alliance with the house of Joseph who reconquered the vicinity of Shechem without a major battle. Although the political power of Canaanite Israel in Shechem was terminated by Egypt, the captives remained in Shechem to assist in the liberation by the house of Joseph.[80] The liberation of Shechem consequently is related to the events which are reflected in Judges 9 and possibly Genesis 34. This suggestion would consider the Israel of Merneptah to be different from the Israel who claimed Jacob as their father; moreover, this theory fills in some of the gaps left by those who attempt to confirm the Exodus by use of the Merneptah Stele.

---

[75] Ibid.

[76] Cf. W. F. Albright, "The Israelite Conquest of Canaan in Light of Archaeology," BASOR, 74:11-23, April, 1939.

[77] Biblical Archaeology, new and rev. ed., p. 71.

---

[78] Noth, History, pp. 1-7, recognized the name "Israel" as the union of tribes only after they had settled in Palestine. Cf. John Gray, Archaeology and the Old Testament World, "Harper Torchbook," p. 78.

[79] Cf. Kathleen M. Kenyon, Archaeology in the Holy Land, 2nd ed., p. 206.

[80] Cf. G. E. Mendenhall, "The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine," BA, XXV:71, 1962.

The Amarna Period

The Amarna Letters (ca. 1390-1365 B.C.) contain important information about the political and social conditions of Central Palestine in the Late Bronze Age. This territory was controlled by a prince called Lab'ayu, who had rebelled against the Egyptian king who ruled Palestine at this time. The prince of Jerusalem, 'Abdi-kheba, complains to Egypt that Lab'ayu has given the land of Shechem to the Habiru.[81] Lab'ayu seems to be closely related to the Habiru and has apparently formed an alliance with them.[82] He has sons who continue their control over the Shechem region and who continue the tradition of their father by causing the Habiru to be a threat to Egyptian control of Palestine.

The story of Lab'ayu and his sons has many parallels to the Jacob tradition connected with Shechem (cf. Gen. 33: 18-20; 34; 48:21-22; 49:5-7), although the two groups were not identical. In fact, the Amarna Letters seem to indicate that Shechem was a strong Canaanite fortress under the tutelage of Egypt; its Canaanite culture preceded Egyptian control of Palestine and also continued for some time after the Amarna Period. Rather than suggesting that Jacob was connected with the Amarna-Age Shechem, the Israel which Merneptah claimed to have destroyed could have been located in or around Shechem. The biblical accounts also present Shechem with strong Canaanite factions (cf. Gen. 34 and Judg. 9), but the Jacob tradition is connected with Shechem only in an aetiological sense. The cultic legends of Shechem will be discussed below; however, the Amarna evidence gives no support for an early direct association of Jacob with Shechem.

---

[81] ANE, p. 274.

[82] Walter Harrelson, "Shechem in Extra-Biblical References," BA, XX:2-10, 1957.

If the equation Habiru, Apiru, Hebrew has validity,[83] the Jacob tradition was related to the Habiru who in a broad sense were sociological groups of wandering warriors of mixed origin who preyed upon people in distress and stimulated trouble.[84] Thus, the setting of the Israelites in Palestine under Joshua, as well as the penetration of this area by Jacob and his people, was a movement much larger than either event by itself.[85] The Jacob tradition can be studied, with some degree of caution, in light of the Habiru movement, since Settlement of the Hebrew tribes in Palestine can be connected with the Habiru movement reflected in the Amarna Letters.

---

[83] See Moshe Greenberg, The Hab/piru, "American Oriental Series," No. 39, for a comprehensive treatment of the problem. For the linguistic aspect of the question, see W. F. Albright, Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan, pp. 64-79; T. J. Meek, Hebrew Origins, "Harper Torchbook" ed., pp. 6-14. On the sociological and historical aspects, see G. E. Mendenhall, op. cit., pp. 66-87; J. M. Holt, The Patriarchs of Israel, pp. 40-59. The evidence is in favor of equating Habiru (SA.GAZ-Akkadian ideogram), Apiru, Apirim (Ugaritic), and Hebrew.

[84] The definition of Kenyon, op. cit., pp. 183, 207.

During the whole period of Egyptian control over Palestine the system of city-states which were grouped along the coastlands never reached the Central Highlands and East-Jordan. Hazor and Shechem held large possessions under a single ruler, e.g., Lab'ayu in Shechem. Under Amenophis III (*ca*. 1406-1370 B.C.) and IV (*ca*. 1370-1353 B.C.) the Central Highlands revolted against Egypt; however, cities of the Central Highlands and East-Jordan are not mentioned in the texts of this period because they had broken relations with Egypt. The remote location of these cities in the rough terrain and away from the trade routes has been explained as reasons for the independence of the mountainous region,[86] but the Central Highlands and the East-Jordan regions still may have been under the influence of the

---

[85] Gray, *op*. *cit*., p. 71.

[86] Albrecht Alt, "The Settlement of the Israelites in Palestine," *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, trans. by R. A. Wilson, pp. 145-57.

North-West Semitic area, while the coastlands were under the rule of Egypt.

The Hyksos Movement

At a period when the power of the Middle Kingdom of Egypt was declining, an invasion by a wave of Asiatics established the rule of the Hyksos ("rulers of foreign lands") in Egypt from 1730-1550 B.C. These alien aristocrats were largely Semitic, although their ancestry was of mixed origin. Kathleen Kenyon suggests that they were warrior bands which were recruited from various sources: from the nomadic Semites of the Arabian desert, from the Hurrians who in the two preceding centuries were moving across north Syria, and from groups of outlaws and dispossessed people.[87] They worshipped the Canaanite god Baal, whom they identified with the Egyptian Seth. The Hyksos introduced the horse-drawn chariot and a possible defense against it when they built steep banks around the town walls to prevent the chariots, or battering rams, from approaching the walls of the city.[88] The Hyksos chose the city of Avaris (Tanis) in the Nile Delta to be their capital from which they ruled Egypt and some of western Asia.[89] One of the Hyksos princes who ruled in Egypt had the West Semitic name of Ya'qob-har ("Jacob, the Exalted One").[90] The Hyksos were expelled from Egypt by Ahmosis (1570-1546 B.C.), the founder of the Eighteenth Dynasty. The Egyptian campaigns which were associated with the expulsion of the Hyksos from Egypt and southern Palestine and the Hyksos invasion of central Palestine caused great agitation of the land of Palestine.[91]

---

[87] "The Archaeology of Palestine-I: Prehistoric and Early Phases," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. by Matthew Black, p. 48 (hereafter, *Peake's*).

[88] *Ibid*.

The Joseph stories in Genesis indicate that the Hebrews plausibly could have lived in Egypt during the Hyksos domination of Egypt. As a part of the Hyksos movement they could have taken advantage of the Hyksos subjection of Egypt to move their herds into Goshen. In Palestine the Hyksos are an important example of the restless and migratory situation of the peoples who were moving through Syria and Palestine similar to the conditions presented by the migration of people in the Jacob tradition in Genesis.

At the same time, the expulsion of the Hyksos may explain the Jacob tradition being connected closely with East-Jordan. As the Egyptians pushed the Hyksos back toward Syria, the indigenous population was forced into the central hill country and across the Jordan. There other displaced tribes and semi-nomadic shepherds formed alliances with the house of Joseph which was later to become the force which settled Palestine under Joshua.[92]

---

[89] Cyrus H. Gordon, The World of the Old Testament, p. 66.

[90] Albright, op. cit., p. 50.

[91] Kenyon, loc. cit.

Hurrians and Patriarchal Customs

Shortly after 2500 B.C., the ethno-linguistic group now called Hurrian emerged as one of the vital factors in the composite civilization of the ancient Near East. Hurrian activity is attested geographically from Elam in the east to Anatolia in the west and from Armenia in the north to Egypt in the south.[93] During the Third Dynasty of Ur the Hurrians began to drift into the Mesopotamian region and began a steady western movement. They are attested in Mari about 1700 B.C., and they set up a capital at Mitanni about 1500 B.C., from which they extended their influence to Nuzi and Alalakh. After the Hurrian movement reached its climax in the middle of the second millennium B.C., a gradual retirement northward began which restricts traces of the Hurrians to an area between northern Mesopotamia and Lake Van between 900 and 600 B.C.[94]

---

[92] Cf. G. E. Mendenhall, "The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine," BA, XXV:71, 1962.

[93] E. A. Speiser, "Ethnic Movements in the Near East in the Second Millennium B.C.," AASOR, XIII, pp. 15-16; I.G. Gelb, "The Early History of the West Semitic Peoples," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, XV:27-47, 1961.

The bulk of the population of Nuzi in the fifteenth century B.C. was Hurrian, the Horites of the Old Testament. That the picture of the Hurrians in the Old Testament is confused and distorted is a well-established fact, according to Speiser. The biblical "Hivites" is a scribal error for "Horite," which has been correctly preserved in the Septuagint.[95] The Nuzi tablets preserve records of social and business transactions of an area to which the patriarchs looked as their ancestral homeland, and the fifteenth century B.C. is a time plausible for patriarchal contact with the Hurrians. If the Hurrians were represented in the Hyksos movements down through Syria and Palestine, the migration of the patriarchs could be paralleled in the Hurrian movement. Thus, the living conditions reflected in the Nuzi documents are relatively close in time and place to those of the Jacob traditions in Genesis.

Since the purpose of marriage for Nuzians was procreation rather than companionship, marriage contracts stipulated that a wife who failed to bear children could provide her husband with a handmaid who could bear children (cf. Gen. 30:3, where Rachel gives Bilhah to Jacob for this reason).[96] Esau's sale of his birthright to Jacob is similar to a Nuzian named Tupkitilla who transfers his inheritance rights to a grove to his brother Kurpazah in exchange for three sheep.[97] The Nuzi adoption laws provide that an adopted son has the right of inheritance. If a son was born to the father after the son was adopted, the two shared the estate. The natural son would have right to the household gods, and ownership of the gods meant leadership in the family and right to the ancestral estate. A condition of the adoption was that the adopted son would agree to marry the daughters of the father. The relationship of Jacob to Laban and Rachel's theft of Laban's gods (Gen. 31:19, 30-35) have been illuminated by the Nuzi tablets.[98] One of the tablets reports a lawsuit in which the court granted the wish of Tarmiya because of the deathbed blessing of his father. "This text conforms to the biblical blessings like those of the Patriarchs in that it is (a) an oral will, (b) with legal validity, (c) made to a son by a dying father."[99]

---

[94] Ignace J. Gelb, Hurrians and Subarians, "The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago: Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization," No. 22, p. 90.

[95] Speiser, *op. cit.*, pp. 26ff.

---

[96] Cyrus H. Gordon, "Biblical Customs and the Nuzu Tablets," BA, III:3, 1940.

[97] Ibid., pp. 4-5.

[98] Ibid., pp. 5-6.

Speiser calls attention to the "maternal" (Ezek. 16:3) influence of the Hurrians on the Hebrews under four headings: (a) in language Hebrew shares with Hurrian the peculiarity of spirantizing post-vocalic stops; (b) the communal differences between Judah and Israel may have been related to the tension between the Hurrian and Hebrew components of the culture of central and northern Palestine; (c) in societal matters Hurrians had numerous instances of influence on the Hebrews; and (d) the Hurrians can be shown to have had a hand in the formulation of those traditions that deal with Urgeschichte (Gen. 1-11), i.e., the Garden of Eden, Tower of Babel, Nimrod, the Creation, and the Flood.[100]

No attempt is made here to call the patriarchs Hurrians; the setting reflected in the Nuzi tablets is similar to that recorded in the biblical traditions. Thus, the Jacob tradition shows kinship with the literature of the North-West Semitic area and could have originated in that region. The type of stories in Genesis which parallel the Hurrian society are those which have to do with a semi-nomadic, pastoral culture in which land was owned and in which migration was resorted to in search of water and pasture for their herds.

---

[99] Ibid., p. 8. Cf. E. A. Speiser, "I Know Not the Day of My Death," JBL, LXXIV:252-56, 1955; idem, "A Significant New Will from Nuzi," Journal of Cuneiform Studies, 17:65-71, 1963.

[100] Speiser, "Hurrian Participation in the Civilization of Mesopotamia, Syria, and Palestine," Oriental and Biblical Studies, ed. by J. J. Finkelstein and Moshe Greenberg, pp. 262-68.

Amorite Shepherds

Archaeological material indicates that a new culture appeared in Palestine about 1900 B.C. which had entered Palestine from the northeast and which had come from an area which possessed a developed civilization. This new culture destroyed cities in Palestine, but did not rebuild with lasting materials. These new people of Palestine buried some skeletal remains in a dismembered state because corpses were carried about on pastoral migrations so that the dead members of a clan could be buried in the tribal burial grounds. The Akkadians called these nomadic type people Amurru ("Westerner"), a term that was connected with northern Arabia and with the Canaanites before about 1600 B.C., but after this date the Arabian connection apparently was lost.[101] Amorite pottery in Palestine points to a north-east origin of these people. That the Amorites existed side by side with the Canaanites who were already present in the land is indicated by linguistic and literary evidence.[102] That this group reached the East-Jordan territory by way of Palestine is probable in view of the similarity of the pottery, weapons, and burial customs from El Husn (East-Jordan), Jericho, Megiddo, and Qatna and Byblos in Syria.[103]

---

[101] Benno Landsberger, "Amorites," Encyclopaedia Britannica (1966 ed.), Vol. I, pp. 809-10.

Since the term "Amorite" takes in the manifold aspects of race, language, geographical location, and social status, their connection with the Jacob tradition is of a general nature and is of importance for this study only for the reconstruction of the setting of the Jacob tradition. The names of some of Jacob's ancestors are the names of some Amorite towns near Haran (Peleg, Serug, Nahor, Terah--Gen. 11:16ff.). The radicals in the name Jacob appear frequently in personal names in the Amorite literature.[104] The Flood stories and the Creation account show affinity with the cosmology of northern Mesopotamia rather than Egypt.[105] The biblical traditions recall that Jacob took a certain section of Canaan from the Amorites (Gen. 48:22). During the Exodus the Amorites controlled West-Jordan and two parts of East-Jordan (Num. 13:29; Deut. 1:19, 20, 44; Num. 21:26-30). Israel is destined to drive out the Amorites (Gen. 15:21; Ex. 3:8; Deut. 7:1, etc.), and Israel is reported as successful in her defeat of the Amorites (Num. 21:25, 31, 32; Josh. 10:5, 6, 28-43). However, a strong remnant of Amorites remained in Palestine (Judg. 1:35; 3:5), and in Samuel's day they lived in peace with Israel (I Sam. 7:14). Solomon incorporated all the Amorites who were still in the land into his forced-labor corps (I Kgs. 9:20, 21; II Chron. 8:7). The E stratum named as Amorites the population (spread out in many small kingdoms) that was conquered by the Israelites. On the other hand, J applied the term to the Canaanites; thus, the two terms must have been synonymous at some point in history. Judges 1:29-36 distinguishes between Canaanites in the South and the Amorites in the North of Palestine.

---

[102] Kathleen Kenyon, Archaeology in the Holy Land, 2nd ed., p. 161.

[103] Ibid., pp. 152-53.

[104] Cf. Herbert B. Huffmon, Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts: A Structural and Lexical Study; Charles F. Jean and Jacob Hoftijzer, Dictionnaire des Inscriptions Sémitiques de l'Ouest, p. 220

The nomadic stories about Jacob-Esau-Laban sound very much like campfire stories of shepherds who would have been very much at home among the Amorites who moved into Syria and Palestine in the Middle Bronze Age. Since such tent-dwelling pastoralists had no great temples, their religion would tend to be simple responses to their deities who were associated with physical phenomena. Temples and sanctuaries were used by the Canaanites already present in the land. Moreover, the burial customs indicate that the Amorites venerated their ancestors in a way which is parallel to the Jacob stories.

---

[105] W. G. Lambert, "A New Look at the Babylonian Background of Genesis," JTS, 16:287-300, 1965.

History of the Name Jacob

Names which contain the stem עקב, from which יַעֲקֹב derives, are relatively common in some of the earliest Semitic literature. The root of the name Jacob appears in Semitic literature long before the earliest estimates of the time in which Jacob is thought to have lived, i.e., *ca*. 2000-1800 B.C.

George A. Barton cites two witnesses who gave their father's name as Yakub-ilu (Jacob-el) in the reign of Apil-Sin (2161-2144 B.C.). In another document a Lamaz had a Jacob-el as his father.[106] T. G. Pinches found Jacob-el among the persons mentioned in contracts of the time of the Babylonian sovereign Sin-muballit (1748-1729 B.C.).[107]

---

[106] *Archaeology and the Bible*, 7th ed., p. 364.

[107] "YÂ and YÂWA (JAH and JAWEH) in Assyro-Babylonian Inscriptions," *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, XV:15, 1893.

Thus, Pinches concluded that the name Jacob was a typical hypocorism, a shortened or endearing form of a primitive compound of Jacob and El. The second element was a god about whom the imperfect form of the verb in the first element made an assertion.[108] F. Hommel found a fitting analogy to Jacob-el in the name of a Babylonian Sheikh *Ya'qub-ilu*, which he interpreted as "God rewards."[109] Kraeling thought that the form *Ya-aqabi* ("Yah is the reward") was possible and that this is what Jacob originally meant.[110] Evidently Kraeling has taken the *Yodh* as an abbreviation for Yah and has assumed that the second element of *Ya-aqabi* is a noun which means reward. Although the abbreviation יָהּ (יהוה) is used in the Old Testament and the *Yodh* in יֵהוּא probably is יהוה (originally יהוהוא, "Yahweh is He"),[111] the use of the imperfect verb with a god as the second element is very common and refutes

---

[108] Cf. Sigmund Mowinckel, "The Name of the God of Moses," HUCA, XXXII:128-29, 1961, who stated that a name containing a verbal form, whether imperfect or perfect, would otherwise always be an abbreviated form of the name concerned and would express the relationship of the god to the bearer of the name. He noted, "As far as I know in the ancient Semitic world there is no divine name consisting of a verb only" (p. 128).

[109] *Geographie and Geschichte des Alten Orient*, p. 167, cited by Emil G. H. Kraeling, *Aram and Israel*, "Columbia University Oriental Studies," Vol. XIII, p. 28, n. 1.

[110] *Ibid.* [111] BDB, p. 219.

Kraeling. During the reign of Hammurabi (*ca*. 1728-1686 B.C.) a Sin-erbiam gave his father's name simply as *Yakub*, or Jacob,[112] thus strengthening the suggestion that Jacob is a hypocrism.

From the eighteenth to about the mid-seventeenth centuries B.C. Egypt was ruled by princes with West Semitic names (Hyksos).[113] On two scarabs of this period are two clear readings, neither of which is a mistake for the other: *Yʿqbhr* and *Yʿqbʾr*. The second element is a divine title which is also found in the Ugaritic texts as "Exalted One," an appellation of Baal. The Egyptians used the *h* in writing this name to prevent the repetition of a harsh Semitic *ʿAyin* in the same name.[114] Thutmose III of Egypt, who made extensive conquests in Asia between 1478-1446 B.C., chiseled the name of a captured Palestinian city into the walls of the great temple of Amon at Karnak in Egypt. This Ganaanite city was called Jacob-el, but what connection, if any, it had with the biblical Jacob is unclear. The Egyptian equivalent of Jacob-el is usually translated "May El protect, guard."[115]

The root *ʿQB* is quite common in the Mari literature of the eighteenth century B.C. Gibson cites *Aqba-aḫum* and *Ḫaqba-ḫammu* as illustrations.[116] Noth even suggests that the *'QB* stem has a whole class of names that belongs to it. Since the *ʿAyin* of this stem is not always reproduced in cuneiform writing, he puts *Aḳbi-il*, *Aḳba-ḫamu* (in addition, *Ḫakba-ḫammu*), and *Aḳba-aḫum* (as well as *Hakba-ahum*) in the *ʿQB* class.[117] For the same reason Gressmann says that *Jaqup-*, *Jakub-*, and *Jakup-el* are possible; so also are *Jaqupum*, *Jakubum*, and *Jakupum* possible.[118]

---

[112] Barton, *loc. cit.*

[113] See above, n. 90.

[114] W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*, p. 50.

[115] *Idem*, "A Third Revision of the Early Chronology of Western Asia," BASOR, 88:36, December, 1942.

The name Jacob also has been found in documents from Chagar Bazar of northern Mesopotamia (*ca*. 1725 B.C.) in two independent but similar forms in Akkadian transliterations (*Ya-aʿ-qu-ub-ilu*). Even the simple *Yakubi* appears in the Chagar Bazar texts.[119]

The stem *ʿQB* is also found in the Ugaritic literature of the fourteenth century B.C. C. H. Gordon cites this stem from 2 Aqat: VI:23, where it refers to the "tendons of a bull" (for making a bowstring). In line 20 of the same text ʿQBM is imported from the Lebanons for the construction of a bow; this note would seem to be some kind of wood.[120] A verb from this stem appears in text 2026:1 in Gordon's Ugaritic Textbook and is translated "be situated in" with a question mark after the translation.[121] This stem is also used with a Mem prefixed in 3 Aqat: rev. 19.[122] G. R. Driver translates MʿQB as "defraud";[123] H. L. Ginsburg proposes the meaning "hinder";[124] and Gordon apparently has used Aramaic and Arabic analogies to get "heel" from this same word.[125] Gordon also cites this stem as a place name five times and as a gentilic reference four times.[126] Obviously, though, no consensus of opinion is available on the meaning of ʿQB.

---

[116] J. C. L. Gibson, "Light from Mari on the Patriarchs," JSS, 7:51, 1962.

[117] Martin Noth, "Mari und Israel eine Personennamenstudie," *Geschichte und Altes Testament*, pp. 142-43.

[118] Hugo Gressmann, "Sage und Geschichte in den Patriarchenerzählungen," ZAW, 30:6, 1910.

[119] Ignatius Hunt, *The World of the Patriarchs*, p. 124.

The ʿQB stem could mean "continue, pursue" (even better, "retribution, reward") in Phoenician inscriptions, according to Jean.[127] In later inscriptions of the Parthian era עקב was found at Hatra in northern Mesopotamia and may mean "end," but that meaning is uncertain.[128] The substantive of this root occurs in Imperial Aramaic meaning "heel."[129] A. T. Olmstead has suggested that the founder of a great Babylonian banking family in the reign of Kandalanu (648-626 B.C.) was named Jacob, transliterated as *Eqibi*.[130]

---

[120] Jean, op. cit., pp. 220-21, noted two bi-literal roots with the radicals עק: one is Palmyrene and means "distress, anguish"; Jean connects the other root with an Imperial Aramaic root, עק, "wood" or "a piece of wood, a plank." A Hebrew word with these two radicals means "to hamstring a horse or ox" (עקר, cf. Gen. 49:6; Josh. 11:6, 9; II Sam. 8:4; I Chron. 18:4).

[121] C. H. Gordon, Ugaritic Textbook, p. 460.

[122] Ibid.

[123] Canaanite Myths and Legends, p. 57.

[124] ANET, p. 152.

[125] Loc. cit.

[126] Ibid. Cf. Virolleaud, "Les Villes et les Corporations du Royaume d'Ugarit," Syria, XXI:126, 134, 1940.

The Arabic cognate of עקב means "requite, punish"; *mu•aqibun* has the sense of "follower, avenger,"[131] عَقَبَ means "he struck his heel; he took his place." عَقَبَهُ is translated as "He took his property in exchange for what he had given him." "He waited" is عَقَّبَ; "he slandered him" is عَقَّبَهُ فِي إِثْرِهِ. The Arabic word for "supplant" is a synonym for "to take another's place," as Jacob took Esau's place. A. Guillaume translates עקב in this last sense in Genesis 27:37 because he sees paronomasia in Jacob taking Esau's birthright *in exchange for* a meal of pottage. Guillaume appeals to the Septuagint reading of Job 37:4 where לא יעקבם ("he does not restrain them") is translated into Greek by οὐκ' ἀνταλάξει αὐτούς ("he shall not exchange them").[132]

---

[127] *Loc. cit.*

[128] *Ibid.*

[129] *Ibid.* Cf. J. N. Strassmaier, *Wörterverzeichniss zu den Babylonischen Inscriften im Museum zu Liverpool*, Vol. I, p. 5, who cites *A-Ka-bi-ilu* from the Imperial Aramaic era.

[130] *History of the Persian Empire*, pp. 83-84.

[131] F. Zimmermann, "Folk Etymology of Biblical Names," Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. XV, pp. 320-21.

From the evidence above one can conclude that Jacob was a common name in the Semitic world prior to and contemporary with the age of the patriarchs of the Old Testament, occurring over a wide geographical territory and over a long period of time. The name Jacob belongs to the North-West Semitic stock of words and is consequently not a peculiarly Hebrew name. Thus, the name probably originated in the North-West Semitic area, a suggestion which corresponds to Jacob's kinship with this area in the biblical traditions. The biblical form of the name is likely a shortened form of the compound word that is usually combined with the name of a deity in extra-biblical literature. The meaning of Jacob cannot be determined from the comparative evidence, since its meaning obviously changed throughout history and is different from culture to culture. The earliest form of the name had something to do with "protection" of a deity. The hypocristic name

---

[132] A. Guillaume, "Paronomasia in the Old Testament," JSS, 9:285, 1964.

Jacob may have denoted "that which the deity protected." In the Old Testament (Gen. 25:26; 27:36) the name is popularly explained as having to do with the "heel." The affinity which the biblical explanation of the name has with it meaning in Imperial Aramaic and its late Arabic cognate indicates that the Hebrew meaning is relatively late.

Transmission of the Pre-Yahwistic Jacob Tradition

Two types of traditions are appropriate for the Bronze Age culture which is reflected in the Jacob traditions of Genesis. First, unattached (i.e., not attached to a holy place) nomadic stories of shepherds would have been told around campfires for entertainment and as heroic tales whose characters could teach and inspire other shepherds. Second, traditions which were attached to holy places (cultic legends) would be expected in the Middle and Late Bronze Ages. Both types of stories are included in the Jacob cycle of traditions, but the complexity of their biblical sources does not permit a conclusive judgment upon which type of tradition is the older of the two. Most likely, the two types of tradition represent two different cultures: one, a nomadic type; the other, a more urbanized and sedentary type. To obtain the maximum elucidation of these early traditions from the principle of

Ortsgebundenheit, the two types of tradition will be analyzed separately, the unattached traditions being studied first.

The unattached Jacob tradition will include the cycle of tradition in Genesis 25-33, including occasional references in Genesis 37-50, but will exclude those traditions within these sections that are attached to holy places. The Jacob cycle of tradition consists of a three-part (four-part, if Joseph is included) movement. Scene one is Jacob's encounter with Esau (Gen. 25:21-27:45); scene two takes up Jacob's relationship with Laban (Gen. 29:1-32:1); and scene three returns Jacob to Palestine where he is reconciled with Esau (Gen. 32:2-33:17). Genesis 37-50 has scattered references to Jacob in the narration of the history of the sons of Jacob.

Geographical Locale of Unattached Jacob Tradition

The Jacob tradition is introduced in the Genesis narratives by setting Jacob and Esau's birth in Beersheba (Gen. 25:11; 26:23-25; 28:10), but Jacob is not at home in this territory and must flee from Esau to Laban (Gen. 27:43). The Priestly source sends Jacob to Laban to obtain a wife from Rebekah's kindred (Gen. 27:46-28:2). Clearly, Beersheba is the locale of the Isaac tradition and is the setting of Jacob's birth because Jacob is related to Isaac. No place name is given in the Birth Narrative itself, nor is a place name given when Rebek~~k~~ah inquired of the Lord at a holy place.

Between the Jacob stories which take place in West-Jordan and those which occur in East-Jordan a fundamental difference exists. In West-Jordan all the stories are attached to a holy place and relate incidents about the founding of a cult; these accounts are basically of the Elohistic version. Also, these same sites could be said to have been founded by Abraham; thus, Jacob's connection with the founding of these holy places was not accepted universally (cf. Gen. 12:6-8).[133] In East-Jordan, Jacob is a more distinctive and livelier figure. Artur Weiser concludes that the original Jacob tradition had its setting in East-Jordan.[134] The force with which the Aramean origin of Jacob is maintained in the Old Testament can be explained in no other way than as a memory of the original home of his descendants, the group which guarded and preserved the traditions of his adventurous life.[135]

---

[133] Eduard Meyer, Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme, pp. 276-77.

[134] "Jakob," Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, ed. by Kurt Galling, 3rd ed., Vol. III, col. 518. Also, G. A. Dannell, Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament, p. 37; Ivan Engnell, Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East, 2nd ed., p. 177.

[135] Eduard Nielsen, Shechem, 2nd ed., p. 127.

Jacob took his journey eastward and came to the land of the people of the east (Gen. 29:1). The "people of the east" is a vague geographical concept for "desert lands."[136] According to the Elohistic version (Gen. 27:43; 28:10; 29:4) the destination of Jacob was Haran, but the older source is not as explicit in localizing the destination of Jacob. The older source (J) locates the homeland and Jacob's relatives in the land of the east. The boundary treaty between Jacob and Laban (Gen. 31:44-55)[137] placed Laban next to Gilead. Eissfeldt has found evidence in inscriptions from Hauran, a region immmediately east of Gilead (in Ezek. 47:16, 18, the ideal eastern border of Canaan), of a people who were sociologically similar to the way of life reflected in the Jacob-Laban stories.[138] The treaty which Jacob concluded peacefully with his kinsman Laban implied that Laban lived nearby.[139] The stone heap which was erected served as a boundary line between Jacob in Gilead and Laban in his territory (Gen. 31:51-52). Gilead is at the most only ten days slow journey from Laban's home (Gen. 31:22-23, J). Travel for the group which is described in Genesis 32:12ff. would be extremely slow. In Genesis 33:12-13, Jacob complains that he cannot rush the children and grazing herds. Thus, Laban's home could easily be less than twenty-five miles from Gilead; three miles per day would be the maximum that could be expected for grazing herds.

---

[136] E. A. Speiser, *Genesis*, "The Anchor Bible," pp. 187, 222 (hereafter, Speiser, *Genesis*).

[137] Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, pp. 194, 199, 201, concluded this passage to be a mixture of his L, J, and E sources; Fohrer, *Introduction*, p. 147, a mixture of N and E; Weiser, *The Old Testament*, p. 101, a mixture of J and E.

[138] "Das Alte Testament im Lichte der safatenischen Inschriften," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 104:88-118, 1954.

[139] Gerhard Wallis, "Die Tradition von den drei Ahnvätern," ZAW, 81:35, 1969.

Jacob's connection with these men of the east means that Jacob's original home was in this area. He is brought into contact with this area by his kinship to these people and by his marriage relationship to the daughters of this area.[140] "*Es ware vielleicht zu vermuten, dass dort auch seine ursprungliche Heimat gelegen habe*."[141]

Although the historical kernel of the Jacob-Esau-Laban history is problematic, hints of early relations between the Hebrews and their neighbors are reflected in these eponymous figures. Esau is clearly localized in Edom (Gen. 25:30). In Genesis 25:25 and 30 Esau is described as "red" (*אדמוני*), an allusion to Edom (*אדום*); Esau is also presented as "hairy" (*שער*), alluding to the later home of Esau in Edom (Gen. 25:25; 27:11, 16, 23; cf. 32:3). Esau came from Seir and returned to Seir after he was reconciled to Jacob who was returning from Laban (Gen. 33:17). The Priestly version has remembered some association between Esau and the Horites who were Edom's predecessors in the land which Edom occupied when Esau married Basemath, a "Hivite" (reading "Hivite" with the Samaritan, LXX, and Syrian versions of Genesis 26:34).[142] The Horites dominated protohistoric Edom if Deuteronomy 2:12 and Genesis 36:20 reflect access to ancient lore. E. A. Speiser suggests that the literary form of Genesis 27, which he classifies as a "Deathbed Blessing," is a legal speech form which was valid in a court of law.[143] Transfer of birthright was also a practice in Nuzi materials.[144]

---

[140] *Ibid*.

[141] *Ibid*.

Clearly, the interpretation of the Jacob-Esau struggle as a symbol of the tension between Israel and Edom did not emerge until at least the period of the monarchy (cf. II Sam. 8:13-14). Even in the Birth Oracle the twins are envisioned as organized states that are not at peace (Gen. 25:23, J). The fact that the precedence of the first-born was reversed probably reveals that Esau represented the older culture which was superseded by the group represented by Jacob.[145]

---

[142] "Hivite," in turn, is a scribal error for "Horite," Speiser, _op_. _cit_., p. 202. See above, n. 95.

[143] "I Know Not the Day of My Death," JBL, LXXIV:252-56, 1955.

[144] _Idem_, "A Significant New Will from Nuzi," _Journal of Cuneiform Studies_, 17:65-71, 1963.

Albright has argued that paronomasia seldom occurs in Ugaritic poetry and is rare in Babylonian literature, but in Egypt it was universal in all periods of history. Paronomasia was introduced into Palestine and Syria through Egyptian contact with Phoenicia, which is evident in the Wen-Amun Report (*ca*. 1060 B.C.).[146] Thus, the prominent display of paronomasia in Genesis 25:21-26 would be quite at home in the Davidic era. Although Albright's argument is weak, other reasons can be adduced for the supposition that later redactors gave a new interpretation to these stories with a reference to national affairs. For one thing, the historical accounts never refer to Jacob and Esau; the figures in these stories arose in some other way and were transferred to the nations at a later time. Also, the characteristics and personalities of the two figures do not correspond to what is otherwise known of Israel and Edom. Edom is known for its wisdom, while Esau is presented as a barbaric dullard. Israel did not achieve dominance over Edom by craftiness or trickery as Jacob obtained the birthright and blessing from Esau; Israel subdued Edom by force (II Sam. 8:13-14).

---

[145] Hermann Gunkel, "Jacob," *What Remains of the Old Testament and Other Essays*, trans. by A. K. Dallas, pp. 176-84, interpreted the whole narrative as based upon the difference of calling between the older culture of the hunter (Esau) which was superseded by the shepherd (Jacob).

[146] W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*, pp. 7-9. Albright's contention is precarious since Egyptian contact with Palestine is shown to have existed from the Hyksos period to the date of the Wen-Amun Report.

Behind the national interpretation of the Jacob-Esau stories are reflections of struggles among pre-Israelite tribes in East-Jordan. The connection of these tribes with the history of the biblical account of Israel's Settlement of East-Jordan is difficult, if not impossible, to determine. Gerhard Wallis conjectures that the historical colonization which is reflected in the Jacob tradition in East-Jordan has been suppressed. He supposes that the Ephraimitic shepherds from West-Jordan made their way into the Gilead section of East-Jordan and were able to supplant the older residents of this area (Judg. 12:4). The Esau figure who resided there was related to the Jacob figure (Ephraim). About the same time the Jacob-Laban complex, which reflected a struggle between Jacob and an Aramaean group, was combined with the Jacob-Esau complex.[147] Von Rad then would add that the connection with Edom and Israel was made only after these traditions were transferred to the Judean south after the establishment of the Davidic monarchy.[148] Before they were transferred to the south, the stories of Jacob-Esau-Laban were floating traditions of shepherds which picked up elements of the cultures in which they lived and survived.

---

[147] Gerhard Wallis (Gemeinschaftsarbeit), "Die Geschichte der Jakob-Tradition," _Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift_

The general picture which the unattached Jacob tradition presents is that Edom is south of Jacob while his northern and eastern borders are to the north and east of Gilead. The western border is not established, but the physical features of the Jordan valley would serve as a permanent border. The land in which Jacob thrives is one in which pasture is abundant; the hill country of East-Jordan is excellent pasture-land and well-suited for a shepherd culture similar to Jacob's.

The Holy Places of the Jacob Tradition

Several holy places or sanctuaries are associated

---

der Martin-Luther Universität Halle-Wittenberg ("Gesellschafts-und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe"), XIII:433, 1964. In contrast to Wallis the biblical evidence states that Gilead subdued Ephraim (Judg. 12:4). In this passage Gilead is referred to as "fugitives of Ephraim," which may lend some support to Wallis' contention, but Ephraim's presence in East-Jordan was later than Wallis proposed.

[148] Genesis, pp. 270-71.

with the Jacob tradition. These holy places can conveniently and meaningfully be divided into two distinct groups: (1) an East-Jordan group including Mahanaim, Penuel, Succoth, Mizpah of Gilead, and Atad beyond Jordan; (2) a West-Jordan group which includes Shechem, Bethel, Beersheba, Ephrath, Migdal Eder, Hebron, and Goshen. An investigation of the attachment of the Jacob tradition to these places will help to determine the circles who preserved the Jacob tradition in its formative stages.

The East-Jordan Holy Places. The holy places with which the Jacob tradition is associated in East-Jordan are difficult to identify and more difficult to locate in the history of the worship of the Hebrews, but they are quite significant in the Jacob tradition.

Mizpah of Gilead. When Jacob concluded a covenant with Laban, a sacred pillar was erected to remind them of the covenant they had made. The setting of this covenant is said to be Gilead, and the pillar is named Mizpah (Gen. 31:44-55). Originally this treaty had to do with the boundary line between Gilead and its Aramean neighbor who is represented by Laban. The treaty may have included provision for fugitives who had arrived at a particular place of protection.[149] Later redactors associated this treaty with a well-known landmark in the territory of Gilead.

---

[149] Von Rad, Genesis, p. 307.

The kernel of the account of the treaty with Laban was very likely a local tradition that was preserved at a holy place called Mizpah.[150] Mizpah is the scene of a covenant between Jephthah and the inhabitants of Gilead, and the expression, "Yahweh will witness between us" (Judg. 11:10), recalls the words used in Genesis 31:44, 48, 52. Another site in the territory of Benjamin is referred to as Mizpah (Josh. 18:26; Judg. 20-21; I Sam. 7:5-7, 11-12, 16; 10:17; I Kgs. 15:22; II Kgs. 25:23, 25; Neh. 3:7; Jer. 40-41; I Macc. 3:46). A critical examination of these texts reveals two problems: (1) the passages which refer to Mizpah as a center of worship bear several signs of lateness and have little claim to historicity,[151] and (2) the site has not conclusively been located.[152] In Judges 20-21, the expression "to go up to Yahweh at Mizpah" is a ritualistic phrase that has been inserted into the text, but the motif of "going up to Yahweh at Mizpah" would be much older than the text. The one thing that is certain is that there was a Yahweh sanctuary at a site called Mizpah which was of significance in early Israel.[153] H. W. Hertzberg even suggests that a "Mizpah source" is present in I Samuel 7:2-7; 10:17-27.[154] This Mizpah source is hostile to a dynastic kingship and has a very high regard for Saul. A stone is erected here at this Mizpah also, but for a theological purpose (I Sam. 7:12). Hosea's mention of a Mizpah (Hos. 5:1) without identifying it further implies that only one Mizpah was known to his audience; Hosea's Mizpah is near the Jabbok in East-Jordan and was known for its pagan practices (cf. Judg. 11:34-40). Even in the Maccabean Period a Mizpah was remembered as a former place of prayer of the Israelites (I Macc. 3:46).

---

[150] *Contra* Albrecht Alt, "The God of the Fathers," *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, trans. by R. A. Wilson, p. 51, who stated that the Jacob treaty is in no way a cultic saga.

[151] James Muilenburg, "The Literary Sources Bearing on the Question of Identification," *Tell En-Nesbeh, Archaeological and Historical Results*, ed. by C. C. McCown, Vol. I, pp. 23-44.

[152] Cf. *idem*, "Mizpah," IDB, Vol. K-Q, pp. 407-409.

During the period of the settlement of the territory of Gilead by groups associated with the later Israelites a tradition of Jacob was connected with a sanctuary called Mizpah in the territory of Gilead. Although no direct evidence is available, the entire Jacob-Laban cycle was likely preserved at this Mizpah sanctuary. Later, it was brought into connection with the Jacob-Esau stories during the era of Saul. The extent of these early traditions of Jacob and Laban cannot be determined any longer, but they likely were simple nomadic-type stories which were associated with water and pasture rights, sheep-breeding, and shepherd-type heroes.

---

[153] H. J. Kraus, Worship in Israel, trans. by Geoffrey Buswell, p. 173.

[154] H. W. Hertzberg, I and II Samuel: A Commentary, trans. by J. S. Bowden, pp. 68, 88-89.

Mahanaim. After Jacob concluded the treaty with Laban, the Elohistic version states that Jacob journeyed to Mahanaim (Gen. 32:1-2).[155] The inference is that Jacob had named the place because he encountered the messengers ("angels") of God there. The purpose of this short passage is to serve as a transition from the Jacob-Laban cycle to another Jacob-Esau cycle. By the thread of a journey Mahanaim is the next stop from Mizpah in Gilead. Mahanaim is located near the Jabbok (Gen. 32:22) in the territory of Gad which bordered Gilead and Manasseh (Josh. 13:26, 30; 21:38). In a list of Asiatic cities under Egyptian control, a Mahanaim is included in the cities which were taken by Sheshonk I (945-924 B.C.).[156] Mahanaim probably was a fortified city since Eshbaal, Saul's son, set up the capital of Ephraimite territory here (II Sam. 2:8-9).

---

[155] Formally the name is a dual of the noun for "camp," thus "two camps." E. A. Speiser, Genesis, "The Anchor Bible," p. 254.

[156] ANET, p. 243.

Rechab and Baanah murdered Eshbaal in this city by slipping past the gate keeper (II Sam. 4:5-7). David later had to flee to Mahanaim to escape the coup of Absalom (II Sam. 17:24-27); at Mahanaim David re-grouped his forces, received reinforcements and allies, and sent his armies against Absalom's Israel, which he defeated (II Sam. 17:27-18:5). Later, Solomon used Mahanaim as the capital of his seventh district (I Kgs. 4:14), but the site is not mentioned after it was presumably destroyed by Sheshonk I about 925 B.C.[157]

This short, independent tradition about the aetiology of the place Mahanaim is connected to the succeeding Jacob-Esau cycle by the continuation of Jacob's journey to Penuel. When Jacob divides his family into "two camps," מַחֲנוֹת (Gen. 32:7, 8, 10, 21), J is making a play on the name Mahanaim (מַחֲנַיִם, "two camps"). Another play on words is מִנְחָה, "present" (Gen. 32:13, 18, 20, 21), which echoes the name Mahanaim.[158]

Not only is Mahanaim a literary transition between the Laban and the succeeding Esau stories, but it is also a geographical transition to a reconciliation with Jacob's southern neighbors, the Edomites (Gen. 32:3-21). After

---

[157] S. Cohen, "Mahanaim," IDB, Vol. K-Q, pp. 226-27.

[158] Hermann Gunkel, Genesis, "Handkommentar zum Alten Testament," 3rd ed., pp. 355-56.

Jacob has apparently settled the dispute with his northern neighbors, Mahanaim becomes the site to prepare for an encounter with Edom. The present text of both these passages contains only fragments of what the traditions once were. Perhaps the original traditions from the shepherd lore told of the struggles and alliances of new-comers to East-Jordan with the Hurrian movement in the land which became Edom (Gen. 26:34; 36:20; Deut. 2:12) and with Aramean groups in Gilead.

The Yahwistic version has not failed to keep in view God's purpose to preserve Jacob in a manner similar to the salvation history of Israel. On the other hand, the Elohistic version places great stress on the "present" which was supposed to appease Esau; the "present" alludes to the place Mahanaim.[159] In short, the E version wants its audience to remember that a holy place existed at Mahanaim, while the J version is interested in the theological relationship of Jacob to the organized state of Israel.

Penuel. After Jacob had crossed the Jabbok, he was spending the night alone when a "man-like" figure wrestled with him until shortly before dawn. The mysterious figure blessed Jacob and gave him the name Israel. Thereupon, Jacob called that place Peniel, "for I have seen God face to face, and yet my life is preserved." Elsewhere, the name of the holy place occurs as "Penuel." At sun-rise Jacob passed by Penuel and was limping because of an injury to his thigh which was sustained by the adversary of Jacob (Gen. 32:22-32). Later, Gideon is reported to have destroyed the tower of Penuel and killed all its male inhabitants (Judg. 8:8-9, 17). Two centuries after Gideon the ruined city of Penuel was rebuilt by Jeroboam I of Israel (I Kgs. 12:25). A Pernoual is listed among the cities which were conquered by Sheshonk I of Egypt; it is also mentioned in late Assyrian records as Panili.[160]

---

[159] See above.

This narrative has undergone a long process of formation, being formed and interpreted for centuries until it finally was fixed in the form it now possesses. Although a multiplicity of sources is apparent in this story, its content and position in the Jacob cycle is substantially Yahwistic.[161] This pericope is tied to the preceding section by the allusion to Penuel in the use of the word "face" פני.[162] However, the transition from Genesis 32:21 to 32:22 and from 32:32 to 33:1 is quite rough and clearly demonstrates the original independence of this pericope.

---

[160] S. Cohen, "Penuel," IDB, Vol. K-Q, p. 727.

[161] Von Rad, Genesis, pp. 314-15.

[162] Gunkel, *loc. cit.*

The earliest stratum of Genesis 32:22-32 was concerned with a hero figure who encountered a god-like antagonist whom the hero almost subdued. The original tradition may have told of a river-spirit or a night-spirit who had engaged in hand-to-hand conflict with a man.[163] Rivers that were difficult to cross were considered to possess a spirit who resented being crossed and who drowned some men who tried to cross them. The request of the antagonist to be released before dawn is connected with a belief that the effectiveness of these spirits was somehow bound up with the darkness of night.[164] For some reason which is no longer apparent this Canaanite tradition was associated with a holy place Penuel, or this story was connected with the founding of a sanctuary at Penuel. Unless the "limping" is a vestige of the old Canaanite cult (cf. I Kgs. 18:26), nothing is known of the cult of Penuel.

During the Settlement of the house of Joseph in East-Jordan, the tradition of Penuel was incorporated into the store of traditions which were told about Jacob, a hero in the tribes of Joseph. Two things happened to Jacob which were associated with the founding of the sanctuary

---

[163] John Skinner, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis, "The International Critical Commentary," p. 411.

[164] Ibid.

Penuel: Jacob received a theophany from God, i.e., he saw the face of God; Jacob is blessed because he was a victor in his struggle with the numen. The blessing is an integral part of the conflict with the god-like spirit and, therefore, is very ancient. The theophany is basic to the establishment of proper worship by the sons of Jacob at Penuel, and, thus, this element is as old as the first use of the sanctuary of Penuel by the Josephites.

The Yahwistic version of this tradition has focused upon the name-changing incident as the thrust of the struggle of Jacob at Penuel. By slightly altering the tradition the change of name is in response to Jacob's demand for blessing, and the new name is a token of the blessing which was promised.[165] The introduction of the name Israel gives a political dimension to the Penuel tradition. John L. McKenzie may be correct when he points out that the realization of the promise to Jacob begins when he sets foot on the land which was traditionally promised to Jacob.[166] Thus, the importance of the Penuel tradition for the J version resides in the political boundary which was located at the Jabbok; according to Judges 11:13, 22, the Jabbok was the eastern frontier of Israel, and Jacob becomes Israel when he enters the land which was promised to those who would bear his new name.[167] McKenzie also suggests that the limp of Jacob is a tacit judgment on the deceptive and crafty Jacob figure.[168] Such an assumption has support in Hosea 12:3-4, but the tradition in Hosea is of a northern provenance and cannot lend much weight to a theory that Jacob was wounded in a conflict with Yahweh. The J version has reinterpreted an older tradition of Jacob in the context of the political and theological presuppositions of an organized state after the rise of the United Monarchy.

---

[165] Gunkel, _op_. _cit_., pp. 362, 365.

[166] "Jacob at Peniel: Gn. 32, 24-32," CBQ, XXV:73-75, 1963.

The Priestly stratum has recalled this interpretation of Genesis 32:24-30 when it placed the name-changing incident on the border of Palestine when Jacob returned from Padan-aram (Gen. 35:9-10); the context is a theophany to authenticate the altar of Bethel. The promise to Jacob is identical with the promise made to Abraham in Genesis 17:7-9 (P), in which the right of Abraham's descendants to the land is verified. Jacob's name is clearly changed by El Shaddai, and the kingship ideology tacitly is joined to the blessing of Jacob. Thus, the Priestly version views the change of name from a Jerusalem perspective, seeking to emphasize that the contemporary state of Israel was related to the promise of land which was given to Jacob and his descendants.

---

[167] Ibid.

[168] Ibid.

The change of Jacob's name to Israel is mentioned again in I Kings 18:31. Elijah, the Tishbite of Gilead (I Kgs. 17:1), took twelve stones, one for each of the sons of Jacob, and built an altar to Yahweh on Mount Carmel, the stronghold of Baal. The word of Yahweh had come to Jacob and had declared that Jacob's name would become Israel (I Kgs. 18:31). P implies that Jacob had received a theophany from Yahweh, at which time Yahweh changed the name of Jacob to Israel. The recalling of this tradition of Jacob is associated with the building of an altar on Mount Carmel and is intended to authenticate the altar on Mount Carmel for the use of Israel. In this context Elijah appeals to Yahweh, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and _Israel_, to make it known that he was God in Israel (v. 36). The Israel which is referred to here is the northern kingdom in the days of Ahab (869-850 B.C.),[169] and a real threat to the worship of Yahweh in the northern kingdom is evidenced in this text. Since renaming often meant that the object of the renaming was brought under the dominion of the one who renames, this passage may reflect Yahweh's supremacy over an El cult in the vicinity of Carmel.[170]

---

[169] John Gray, _I and II Kings: A Commentary_, pp. 356-58, suggested that I Kgs. 18:31, 36 reflect the crystallization of the northern version of the patriarchal traditions which became the E source of the Pentateuch.

A late deuteronomic editor has injected a polemic against the worship of the Samaritans who were not to be credited with true worship of Yahweh either before the fall of the northern kingdom or afterward. The people were accused of rejecting the precepts of law which Yahweh "commanded the children of Jacob, whom he named Israel" (II Kgs. 17:34). The change of name is here related to the history of the salvation of the covenant people of God. The editor implies that the children of Jacob represented the covenant people of Yahweh and that later Yahweh named them Israel. Thereupon, Israel, who later became the Samaritans, is given the commandments; however, "they would not listen, but they did according to their former manner" (v. 40).

The name-changing tradition of Genesis 32:22-32 is J's application of the Jacob tradition to the political entity of Israel. The application of the name Israel to the union of the Joseph tribes with some western tribes of the house of Leah had already occurred in the north.[171] The J version is relating this name-change to the whole commonwealth of the twelve tribes under David and Solomon. The change of name was intended to reflect the authority of the new kingdom to the whole land of Palestine; the sons of Jacob were entitled to all of the land which was promised to Jacob.

---

[170] Cf. Otto Eissfeldt, "Renaming in the Old Testament," trans. by Eckhard von Rabenau, *Words and Meanings: Essays Presented to David Winton Thomas*, ed. by P. R. Ackroyd and Barnabas Lindars, pp. 70, 72, 76.

Succoth. The narrator of Genesis 33:16 has given an aetiological reminiscence of Jacob's connection with a place called Succoth without suggesting any special opinion for the reader.[172] After Jacob was reconciled to his brother Esau, Jacob is reported to have established a residence at Succoth, and Esau returns to his home in Edom. Thus, Jacob and Esau are pictured as existing in peace.

Succoth is probably to be identified with *Deir 'Allah*, a town of Gad (Josh. 13:27) in the Jordan Valley about one-half of a mile north of the Jabbok. Aharoni suggests that Succoth, as well as some other East-Jordan cities, were established in the Late Bronze Age as a result of the

---

[171] *Idem*, "Jakobs Begegnung mit El und Moses Begegnung mit Jahwe," *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, LVIII:331, 1963, connected the name Israel with Shechem and postulated the merging of Jacob with a Canaanite group called Israel. Eissfeldt dated this merger one or two centuries before the Settlement. Cf. below, the section on "Shechem."

[172] Von Rad, *Genesis*, p. 323.

Egyptian expulsion of the Hyksos from Canaan.[173] A Late Bronze Age temple was found at *Deir 'Allah* which served as a central sanctuary for the tribes in that vicinity.[174] The small fires, charred bones, and altar stoves point to a fire-cult at this site. A semi-nomadic culture followed the Late Bronze Age era, since pottery and other relics were found with no trace of buildings.[175]

If Jacob's journey to Succoth is connected with the account of the separation of Jacob and Esau which immediately precedes this passage,[176] the announcement of Esau's return to Seir made it fitting for Jacob to journey to his dwelling place. Thereupon, Jacob is pictured as a settled shepherd prince who built himself a house and "booths" for his cattle. The motive for Jacob's behavior is the previous presentation of Esau as a wealthy prince.[177] This very old tradition was told at a holy place near the Jabbok and was associated with the name of the place.

---

[173] Yohanan Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible: A Historical Geography*, trans. by A. F. Rainey, p. 187.

[174] H. J. Franken, "Excavations at Deir 'Allā, Season 1964," VT, XIV: 419-22, 1964. However, Franken rejected *Deir 'Allah* as Succoth.

[175] *Ibid*., p. 419.

[176] Skinner, *op. cit*., p. 414, commented that the precedence of the subject indicates a contrast and shows that v. 17 continues v. 16.

[177] Hermann Eising, *Formgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Jakoberzählung der Genesis*, p. 291.

However, Burke O. Long has made a thorough study of the form of aetiological narratives and has concluded that verse 17 is subordinate to the main dramatic movement of the preceding account concerning Jacob and Esau.[178] The construction of a house by Jacob was necessitated by the explanation of the name of Succoth as a place where Jacob built houses for his cattle. If Jacob built "booths" for his cattle, the tradition circles had Jacob to do something no other patriarch did, i.e., build a house. The building of a house by Jacob is a reflection on an older tradition which reported that Jacob built "booths" for his cattle.

Atad beyond Jordan. A very ancient tradition recalled that Jacob was buried in East-Jordan at Atad beyond Jordan (Gen. 50:10-11, J). Jacob had told Joseph that he had prepared a tomb in the land of Canaan and made Joseph swear that he would bury him there (Gen. 50:5). The Canaanites are reported to have named the threshing floor of Atad "Abel-mizraim" ("meadow" or "mourning" of Egypt) because a great lamentation was held at this place for the death of Jacob. The sixth-century mosaic map of Medeba indicates that an Alon Atad (terebinth of Atad) was located by the side of Beth Agla (biblical Beth-hoglah) between Jericho and the Dead Sea.[179] If the place name Jacob-el which appears on the Karnak temple of Thutmoses III (ca. 1490-1436 B.C.) could be located in the central section of East-Jordan,[180] and this location is not impossible,[181] the burial tradition of Jacob in East-Jordan would be strengthened by an extra-biblical allusion to an unidentifiable area in East-Jordan as Jacob-el.

---

[178] _The Problem of Etiological Narrative in the Old Testament_, "Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft," Heft 108, pp. 11-12.

The East-Jordan burial of Jacob is essentially Yahwistic, but J's purpose in preserving this tradition is not clear. J is careful that Jacob will not be buried in Egypt (cf. Gen. 47:29-31), but that Jacob be returned to the land where he had received the blessing and the name-change. After Jacob is properly buried, Joseph is allowed to announce the hope of an Exodus (Gen. 50:15-26, essentially E). A connection is maintained between the promise of land and the location of Jacob in East-Jordan; this area was the locale of the first stages of the Settlement of the land which was promised to Jacob and his descendants.

---

[179] S. Cohen, "Atad," IDB, Vol. A-D, p. 305.

[180] S. A. Cook and T. H. Robinson, "Jacob," Encyclopaedia Britannica (1966 ed.), Vol. 12, p. 834, suggested an East-Jordan location for this Jacob-el.

[181] In the Thutmose list Jacob-el appears as No. 102. Nos. 80-102 take in the area of Galilee or central Palestine. Although no attempt has been made to locate any of this group in East-Jordan, note No. 105 ("Rabbah" [of Ammon?]) and No. 107 ("the valley" [Jordan?]). Cf. Aharoni, op. cit., pp. 140-53.

A much later stratum (P) has difficulty with Jacob being buried in East-Jordan and has the sons of Israel to bury their father in the cave at Machpelah together with his wife Leah (Gen. 49:28-33; 50:12-13). Either the East-Jordan location was unsatisfactory to the audience of the time of P, or P has drawn upon a source that is independent of the tradition which J preserves. If the second alternative is correct, P has preserved an ancient tradition which seems to prefer the name Israel as the patriarch and which recalls Israel's wife as Leah.[182] Two separate traditions, one of Jacob and another of Israel, best explain the existence of these contradictory traditions about the burial of Jacob. If this statement can be supported, a very old tradition about the burial of Jacob was preserved by a group in East-Jordan, i.e., the house of Joseph.[183]

That the threshing floor of Atad was once a holy place is quite probable, although the location of Atad has not been successful. This holy place could have been connected with some other sanctuary, and the name Atad was lost in antiquity. The lack of identification could stem from the fact that Atad acquired a reputation which later tradition circles wished to suppress.

---

[182] Rachel is prevented from coming near the area of Hebron by dying while still a long way from Ephrath (Gen. 48:7; I Sam. 10:2; Jer. 31:15).

[183] See below.

Summary. Jacob is not to be viewed as an exclusively eponymous individual who attracted all of the traditions of the group he represented. Many of the traditions which are associated with Jacob were originally independent traditions that had nothing to do with Jacob; some of the Jacob stories were earlier traditions told in Canaanite circles.[184] The Jacob figure of these East-Jordan traditions is a hero-type of shepherd who was recognized as a founder or reformer of the worship in the East-Jordan shrines. These traditions are some of the earliest traditions that have been preserved about Jacob; the unattached cycles of traditions about Jacob, Esau, and Laban show a general affinity to these East-Jordan traditions and may very easily come from the same culture area.

The West-Jordan Jacob Tradition. The Jacob tradition is associated with several West-Jordan sites, some of which serve as important sanctuaries in the history of Israel (e.g., Shechem, Bethel, Hebron, and Beersheba). The concern of the study of these sites will involve the nature of the connection of Jacob with these holy places and a comparison of these findings with the study of the East-Jordan sites.

---

[184] Cf. Ivan Engnell, Studies in Divine Kingship, 2nd ed., p. 177; G. A. Danell, Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament, p. 37, 46; Eduard Meyer, Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme, pp. 276-77; Otto Eissfeldt, "Jakobs Begegnung mit El und Moses Begegnung mit Jahwe," Orientalistische Literaturzeitung, LVIII:331, 1963.

Shechem. According to Genesis 33:18-20,[185] Shechem was the first place which Jacob reached after he crossed the Jordan on his return from Paddan-aram (v. 18). Here, Jacob erected an altar on the land he had purchased and called it אֵל אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל "El is the God of Israel," (v. 20). In Genesis 34, the strange account of the seduction of Dinah, the daughter of Jacob and Leah, is reported to have occurred at Shechem.[186] The remainder of the chapter relates how Simeon and Levi sacked the city.

---

[185] Von Rad, Genesis, p. 323, "The narrative derives mainly from J, but E also shares in it, at least vss. 5 and 11." Otto Eissfeldt, Hexateuch-Synopse, p. 69, divides the passage into his L and E strata, with the exception of the reference to Paddan-aram (v. 18) which most critics ascribe to P, C. A. Simpson, "The Book of Genesis: Introduction and Exegesis," IB, Vol. I, p. 731, called it a conflation of J^2, E, and P. S. H. Hooke, "Genesis," Peake's, p. 199, attributed this passage to the Elohist.

[186] No satisfactory delineation of the sources of Gen. 34 has been achieved. Basically, this chapter is an independent tradition that has been shaped by both J and E.

Jacob thereupon holds a cultic observance under an oak near Shechem in which he disposed of foreign gods (Gen. 35:1-4).[187]

The character of Jacob at Shechem is quite different from the figure who seemed so much at home in East-Jordan. In contrast to his residence in East-Jordan, Jacob is the founder of a holy place at Shechem; the reason for this deed seems to be either the authentication of a previously Canaanite holy place for Yahweh worship or an explanation of the presence of an El cult. Either of these reasons is plausible since Jacob is here giving recognition to an El cult. Whereas Jacob was a nomadic type of shepherd in East-Jordan, at Shechem he purchases land and becomes "settled." Hamor invites Jacob and his sons to inter-marry with his people and to trade, to dwell, and to buy property there (Gen. 34:10, 21). At Shechem, Jacob is dwelling in a fixed location while his sons are in the fields tending his sheep (Gen. 34:5; cf. Gen. 37:12ff.). Although Jacob shares the establishment of the altar at Shechem with Abraham (Gen. 12:6-7), he is the sole patriarch of the East-Jordan holy places. Moreover, unlike the treaty with Laban, the sons of Jacob (not Jacob) are the ones who deal with Shechem and his father Hamor. If the "shoulder"

---

[187] This passage is essentially Elohistic.

(שְׁכֶם) in Genesis 48:22 is Shechem, Jacob would be characterized as more violent at Shechem than he was in East-Jordan. The sons of Jacob, and especially Simeon and Levi, demonstrate a military trait that is absent in East-Jordan (cf. Gen. 34:7, 13, 25, 27ff.).

Both Leah and Dinah are accorded a place of prominence at Shechem which is totally absent in East-Jordan. The differences may be noted as follows: in East-Jordan Leah becomes the wife of Jacob by trickery (Gen. 29:26), whereas at Shechem she appears to be a wife of good standing. She was hated by Jacob in East-Jordan (Gen. 29:30-31) and was inferior to Rachel (Gen. 30:8); although the older of the sisters, she did not claim the household gods of Laban, which signified family leadership and right to inheritance of the property (Gen. 30:19). Two of Leah's sons are the assailants of the city of Shechem. Finally, the last mention of Leah in the Joseph narrative has elevated her to be the wife of Israel, and she is buried in the cave at Machpelah together with Abraham and Sarah, his wife, and Isaac and Rebekah, his wife (Gen. 49:29-32). Note also that only two of Dinah's brothers are mentioned in this account with no acknowledgment of Reuben, Judah, Issachar, and Zebulun (cf. Gen. 34:25; 30:21; 46:15). Although other reasons could be deduced for Dinah's close association with only Simeon and Levi, Genesis 34 implies that these brothers are related to Dinah through a confederacy of the Leah tribes in western Palestine.

These differences in the traditions demand a serious consideration of the arguments for a separate existence of an Israel tradition in the context of Shechem. The arguments of Horst Seebass for a separate Israel are convincing, and a summary of his position will be helpful.[188] A patriarch does exist in Genesis who has a double name (or two names), i.e., Jacob-Israel. The renaming of Jacob in Genesis 35:10 presupposes that originally the name Israel denoted a group that did not extend beyond the territory of Shechem; the name must have been transferred to Bethel by a cultic act because of its adherence to Shechem.[189] The analogy of Jacob belonging to Bethel and its territory intimates that Israel was a patriarchal figure just as was Jacob. The name Israel is a personal name that is attested in the Ugaritic literature.[190] The phrases "God of Abraham,

---

[188] Der Erzvater Israel und die Einführung der Jahweverehrung in Kanaan, "Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft," Heft 98, pp. 25-34.

[189] Cf. Albrecht Alt, "Die Wallfahrt von Sichem nach Bethel," Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel, Vol. I, pp. 79-88.

[190] Cf. E. Vogt, "Nomen Israel in Tabulis Ugariticis," Biblica, 38:375, 1957, who commented that Ch. Virolleaud found "Israel" in a Ras-Shamra tablet in 1955, which he reported in Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Comptes-Rendus, 1956, pp. 60-67. The tablet in which the

God of Isaac, God of Jacob," and "God of Israel" are very similar to each other. If the Israel tradition is separate, the narrative reports a particular ritual at Shechem (Gen. 35:2, 4) and a confession of the patriarch to the God who had brought him to Shechem (35:3b; cf. 31:13b*a*, 14, 16b, 21a; Deut 26:5ff.; Josh. 24:2, 3a, b*a*). Against the separate existence of Israel one should not bring into the argument the combination of Abraham and Isaac on one side and Jacob and Israel on the other side as if Israel could have been united with Jacob only in the form of a genealogical arrangement. Seebass believes he has demonstrated that the objective material of God's guidance in the wilderness experience corresponds to each group having its own God.[191] To summarize, Seebass is arguing for Israel as a separate patriarch with his own cult.

Eissfeldt supports Seebass by connecting the name of Israel with Shechem and by postulating the merging of a Jacob group with a group (perhaps Canaanite) named Israel. The name Israel probably derives from the cultic replacement

---

name Israel occurs is an administrative tablet which dates about 1400 B.C. "Israel" is a *maryannu*, a warrior (usually a charioteer who was international). Also see C. H. Gordon, "Hebrew Origins in the Light of Recent Discovery," *Biblical and Other Studies*, ed. by Alexander Altmann, p. 8.

[191] Seebass, *loc. cit.* Cf. Albrecht Alt, "The God of the Fathers," *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, trans. by R. A. Wilson, pp. 1-77.

of a neutrally old name by attaching the theophorous element El; thus, the Jacob group avowed their allegiance to El (Gen. 18:20).[192] The name Israel would have originated on Canaanite soil (Gen. 32:24ff.; 35:9ff.),[193] and it contained no reference to Yahweh who was the God of the covenant people in the Exodus and at Sinai. Israel's name is bestowed upon the Jacob group by an unidentified being[194] in Genesis 32:24ff. and by Bethel or El Shaddai in Genesis 35:7ff.

If the above evidence points to a separate existence for Israel, Noth was correct when he proposed that a group of tribes (perhaps six) used Shechem as a worship center and that the group bore the name Israel; Noth believed that this early tribal league existed before the twelve-tribe league accepted the worship of Yahweh under Joshua.[195] The cult of this early tribal league was some form of El cult. R. E. Clements has suggested that Baal Berith (cf. Judges

---

[192] Otto Eissfeldt, *loc. cit.*

[193] G. A. Danell, *Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament*, pp. 39-41. Cf. Roland de Vaux, "The Hebrew Patriarchs and History," *Theology Digest*, XII:229, 1964, who thought the change of name reflected a change from an Amorite linguistic group to a Canaanite linguistic group.

[194] Cf. above, n. 163.

[195] Martin Noth, *Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels*, "Beiträge zur Wissenschaft von alten und neuen Testament," Vierte Folge, Heft 1, pp. 76, 91.

9:4-6) was the god of the urban culture of Shechem which was represented by the "sons of Hamor," and El-Elohe-Israel was the name of the god of the unsettled tribes around Shechem.[196] Clements identified the name Israel with the mixed population in the region around Shechem; however, Clements did not suggest that the "settled group" in Shechem could have been the "sons of Israel" and that the "mixed population" outside Shechem could have been the Jacob group.

An early tribal league at Shechem probably contained some of the Leah tribes, which may explain why Simeon and Levi were influential at Shechem.[197] Whether Judah and Reuben were connected with Shechem is difficult to determine; the behavior of Judah and Reuben in the Joseph history likely is a later reflection of the Leah tribes. If the etymology of Genesis 29:37 is accurate, Simeon could be a hypocoristic name corresponding to the name "Ishmael."[198]

---

[196] "Baal-Berith of Shechem," JSS, XIII:23, 24, 1968. G. E. Wright, Shechem, pp. 130-31, has incorrectly identified Baal-Berith with Yahweh.

[197] Murray L. Newman, The People of the Covenant, pp. 79, 111, maintained that Shechem was the cult center of the Leah confederacy and that this group used the name Israel in the fourteenth century B.C. Their holy shrine was the Ark of the Covenant, which later became the throne of Yahweh and the center of worship of the northern tribes.

[198] Eduard Nielsen, Shechem, p. 259.

The putting away of the foreign gods by Jacob may preserve an ancient reference to the Ishmaelites (Gen. 35:4), since some Midianites were later said to wear rings in their ears "because they were Ishmaelites" (Judg. 8:24). The earrings were buried under the oak near Shechem where the oak of Moreh and the *massebah* were located. Notice that the household of Jacob must be purified before they can go up to Bethel. A later audience evidently demanded a cultic cleansing from the taint of a Canaanite cult. Several negative statements are included in the Shechem traditions (e.g., Gen. 34:7, 13-14, 30-31; 35:2), which would indicate that later tradition circles had difficulty with the Canaanite overtones at Shechem.

The chronological relationship of a very early Israel group to the biblical traditions is a stubborn problem. Eissfeldt locates this early Israel group one or two centuries before the Settlement under Joshua.[199] The Jacob group has fused with the Israel group by accepting the El cult at Shechem. The Amarna Letters offer some valuable insight about the nature of the religious and political situation of Shechem in about 1400 B.C., but the Amarna material must not be equated with the biblical traditions about Shechem in Genesis 33-35.[200] The archaeological evidence indicates that Shechem was not destroyed at the beginning of the Iron Age as were Lachish, Hazor, Bethel, etc. This fact accords with the absence of a destruction, or "Conquest," of Shechem by Joshua in the biblical records (cf. possible exception in Gen. 34:25ff.; 49:5-7; 48:22). If a change in the political and/or religious persuasion of Shechem occurred between the Late Bronze Age and the beginning of the Iron Age, this transition was a peaceful coalescence in which a foreign group effected a symbiosis with the local Canaanites.[201]

---

[199] *Loc*. *cit*.

That the people of Shechem had amalgamated from two or more diverse groups can still be seen in the episodes of Gideon and Abimelech, kings of Manasseh, which ~~is~~ are recorded in Judges 6-9. Gideon had expelled the Midianites from the central section of West-Jordan and had pursued them across the Jordan into Gilead, demanding assistance from Succoth and Penuel. Subsequently, the sons of Israel asked Gideon to be their king because he had delivered them from the Midianite menace (Judg. 8:22); Gideon refused by asserting that Yahweh should rule over them. Then he took the rings that identified the Midianites as Ishmaelites and made an ephod and placed it in his home city, Ophrah.[202] When Gideon died, the sons of Israel turned back to their worship of Baal and turned their back upon Yahweh. Abimelech took advantage of the situation and pointed out to the Shechemites that he was of their stock and that one ruler was better than seventy. Thereupon, Abimelech was crowned king of Shechem near the oak and the pillar at Shechem. After Abimelech had ruled for three years from his capital at Arumah, a spirit of rebellion developed in Shechem against Abimelech. At this point a certain Gaal "crossed over"[203] to Shechem to live with his kinsmen (9:26, 31). Gaal told the Shechemites that Abimelech was only half-Shechemite and gained the confidence of a group of dissenting Shechemites. However, he was undermined by Abimelech's officer in Shechem, and Gaal and his kinsmen were driven out of Shechem (9:41). After destroying Shechem, Abimelech went to Thebez where he was killed by a woman who dropped a millstone on his head. "When the 'sons of Israel' saw that Abimelech was dead, they departed every man to his home" (9:55) [author's translation].

---

[200] Albert de Pury, "Genēse XXXIV et l'Historie," RB, LXXVI:42ff., January, 1969. This article is a comprehensive treatment of the historical problems. De Pury agrees with Seebass' arguments for a separate Israel.

[201] Cf. Edward F. Campbell, Jr., and James F. Ross, "The Excavation of Shechem and the Biblical Tradition," *The Biblical Archaeologist Reader*, *2*, ed. by D. N. Freedman and Edward F. Campbell, Jr., pp. 284-85.

---

[202] The geographical location of Ophrah has not been determined. Several rather widely separated sites have been suggested for its location, but no one of them contains sufficient material to encourage confidence in its identification with Ophrah. Cf. W. H. Morton, "Ophrah," IDB, Vol. K-Q, p. 607; Yohanan Aharoni, The Land of the Bible, trans. by A. F. Rainey, p. 241.

[203] Campbell and Ross, op. cit., p. 286, n. 28, asked, "Does this mean that Gaal was from the other side of the Jordan?" The RSV has "moved into" for the Hebrew word meaning "cross over."

The Gideon story assumes that some sort of community existed between the Shechemites and the Manassites in the period of the Judges. Gideon was a charismatically endowed Yahwist (Judg. 6:12, 22) who pulled down the altar of Baal, cut down the Asherah, and built an altar to Yahweh (6:25-27). His name was changed to Jerubbaal because he had contended with Baal and had pulled down his altar (6:32). The "sons of Israel" were distinguished from the Manassites (cf. 6:6, 8; 8:22, 34; 9:22, 55): the sons of Israel made Baal Berith their god, rejected Yahweh, and were unkind to the kinsmen of Gideon (Manassites) in Shechem (8:35). Abimelech was one of the sons of Israel who took advantage of this division between the Manassites and the sons of Israel and who became the king of the sons of Israel and some citizens of Shechem (9:6), but not king of Manasseh. Jotham appealed to this spirit of division when he reminded the men of Shechem that the election of Abimelech as king was not satisfactory to the house of Manasseh (9:18ff.); Jotham called upon the Shechemites to rebel against Abimelech (9:20). After only three years of the rule of

Abimelech, a group in Shechem (sympathizers of Manasseh?) were reported to be alienated from Abimelech (9:23). Consequently, Gaal and his kinsmen went to Shechem and stirred up a group of Shechemites against Abimelech (9:31) by accusing Abimelech of serving the sons of Hamor who was the father of Shechem (cf. 8:26-28). The reason why the people of Shechem were so easily stirred to a spirit of insurrection during Abimelech's reign was because a cleavage between the Canaanite sons of Israel and the house of Manasseh already existed. At the climax of the Abimelech episode, the sons of Israel were associated with Abimelech (9:55) and returned to their homes after his death. A later tradition circle has noted that the destruction of Shechem was the fulfillment of the curse of Jothan, the son of Gideon (9:57), and retribution was thereby gained on behalf of the sons of Manasseh (Jotham) for the transgressions of Abimelech, a son of Israel.

These narratives in Judges 6-9 reflect originally independent tradition complexes which were preserved by later Israelite inhabitants of Shechem.[204] Judges 1:27 shows the Manassites and Canaanites existing side by side; thus, the "sons of Israel" is an expression which refers to the Canaanite element in Shechem, which is similar to, or identified with, the sons of Israel mentioned in the Shechem narratives in Genesis 33:18-35:4.

---

[204] _Ibid_., pp. 287-91; Eduard Nielsen, _Shechem_, p. 161.

This analysis of the Shechem traditions in Genesis 33:18-35:4 encourages the conclusion that this passage has preserved an independent tradition complex which attests to a group of Canaanite "sons of Israel" who lived in and around Shechem before the establishment of the Israelite tribal league.[205] These traditions were preserved by the Manassites who merged with the "sons of Israel," and the evidence indicates that Jacob was a patriarch in the tribe of Manasseh and "Israel" was a patriarch in the Canaanite Shechem. Since the Manassite territory extended into Gilead and East-Jordan, the Jacob tradition of East-Jordan was fused with these Shechem traditions by the Manassites. Whether the independent traditions at Shechem preceded the local traditions of Jacob in East-Jordan cannot be ascertained. Manasseh settled East-Jordan from the west,[206] but the nature of this settlement and the character of the people who are called Manasseh remains obscure (cf. Josh. 17).

---

[205] De Pury, _op_. _cit_., p. 48; Seebass, _loc_. _cit_.

[206] Cf. Judg. 12:4. The Gileadites are called "fugitives from Ephraim," but John Gray, _Joshua_, _Judges_, _and Ruth_, "The Century Bible, New Edition," p. 340, suggested that these words are the result of _parablepsis_ of v. 5. Some manuscripts of the LXX omit these words.

The hand of later traditionists has been at work on Genesis 33:18-35:4, but to divide this passage simply between J and E is a mistake.[207] The original tradition was concerned with the marriage between the "sons of Israel" and the citizens of Shechem. Jacob, who now has a secondary position in the tradition,[208] was fused with Israel as a result of the merger between the Canaanites and Manassites. The Manassites preserved this tradition until it was accepted into the cult of the United Monarchy. J is probably responsible for the negative interpretation of Shechemites as gullible, uncircumcised, unclean Canaanites. In Genesis 34:7, J views Israel as an organized state with a sense of national morality (cf. vv. 14, 27, 31). The E version is difficult to distinguish from the very ancient tradition that was preserved in the northern kingdom. E reflects a more objective evaluation of the Shechem incident than does J and calls for a cleansing of Jacob and his household before he can establish a holy place at Bethel (Gen. 35:1-4).[209]

---

[207] De Pury, loc. cit.; Seebass, loc. cit. Surprisingly, von Rad, Genesis, p. 325, favors "an actual parallel variant" to the basic J narrative. What von Rad calls J is probably the very ancient tradition which was probably preserved by the Manassites.

[208] Von Rad, op. cit., p. 327, remarked concerning Jacob's passive (v. 5) and non-committal attitude, "It is actually possible that Jacob's strange position as outsider is to be explained by the fact that the older form of the narrative did not know the figure of Jacob at all."

To summarize, Jacob had no connection with the original tradition of a Canaanite group called "Israel." Jacob was introduced into the tradition when the Manassites avowed their acceptance of an El cult at Shechem. The date of this Jacob-Israel fusion may be placed between 1550 B.C. and 1250 B.C., i.e., after the Hyksos were pushed back into Palestine, but well before the organization of the tribal league under Joshua. A more definite dating is impossible.

Bethel. Jacob's journey to the sons of the east (or Laban) begins and ends at a place called Bethel (Gen. 28:10-22; 31:13; 35:1-15). Three important things happen to Jacob at Bethel: he receives a theophany, he receives a promise and new name, and he builds an altar. That the Bethel traditions are local and independent can be demonstrated by several considerations. First, two reasons are given for the journey to the east: (1) Jacob goes to Laban to escape the wrath of Esau (Gen. 27:42-45, E) and (2) Jacob makes the journey to obtain a wife from the family of Laban (Gen. 27:46-28:9). However, when the journey is actually begun, neither reason is mentioned. Second, the

---

[209] Cf. Hermann Gunkel, Genesis, "Handkommentar zum Alten Testament," 3rd ed., pp. 378-79.

Bethel traditions are placed between the Jacob-Esau cycle (Gen. 25-27) and the Jacob-Laban cycle (Gen. 29-31), but the transition is not smooth. The traditions of Jacob at Bethel deal with the establishment of worship and have nothing to do with the journey. Finally, Jacob began his journey at Beersheba and has arrived at Bethel before the sun has set (Gen. 29:10-11); the distance between these two points (over 50 miles by air) is too great for a day's travel. Thus, local traditions at Bethel were likely associated with Jacob when a Jacob tradition circle came in contact with Bethel.

The city of Bethel was founded approximately 2000 B.C. and had a long history as a Canaanite city before it was taken by the house of Joseph (Judg. 1:22; cf. Josh. 12:16).[210] Archaeological excavations by Albright and Kelso have demonstrated that the city suffered a violent destruction in the late fourteenth or early thirteenth centuries B.C., and that it was destroyed several times during the period of the Judges.[211] An El cult very probably was a regular feature of the Canaanite worship at Bethel. In fact, a West Semitic diety called "Bethel" is attested in extra-biblical literature and probably was worshipped at the place called Bethel (cf. Gen. 31:13; Jer. 48:13; Amos 5:5).[212]

---

[210] J. L. Kelso, "Bethel (Sanctuary)," IDB, Vol. A-D, pp. 391-93.

[211] Ibid.

The Elohistic thread of the Bethel narratives alludes to the existence of the El cult which preceded the Hebrew system of worship.[213] E views the place according to the West Semitic culture-pattern, i.e., the house of a god was the place where the god appeared to men on earth. The staircase was not only the passageway from the realm of the gods to the seat of their rule on earth, but also was a symbol, or representation, of the cosmos which formed the true abode of El.[214] The name Bethel is related to the manifestation of the god worshipped at the shrine; the name of the god was either El-Bethel or Beth-el.[215] E also presents Jacob's journey from Shechem to Bethel as if the journey were a cultic pilgrimage which acknowledged a change in the deity to be worshipped at Bethel (Gen. 35:1-8).[216] According to E, a massebah also is erected at Bethel and is related to the El cult, but its purpose in the cult is no longer apparent in the present texts of the tradition. E has divided the Bethel narratives into two scenes: (1) the theophany (Gen. 28:11-12, 17, 19-20, 21a, 22a); (2) after his return from the East he consecrates the cult of Bethel at the command of Elohe Israel of Shechem (Gen. 35:1-51, 7-8, 10, 14). The entire Elohistic version of the Jacob tradition is held together by a journey motif.

---

[212] J. P. Hyatt, "The Deity Bethel and the Old Testament," JAOS, 59:81-98, 1939.

[213] Cf. Albrecht Alt, "The God of the Fathers," Essays on Old Testament History and Religion, trans. by R. A. Wilson, p. 51; Seebass, op. cit., pp. 21-22. E gives much more complete information about the holy places of Shechem and Bethel, and J must have borrowed its narrative of Abraham at these sites from the E thread.

[214] Cf. R. E. Clements, God and Temple, pp. 3ff.

[215] Clearly an El Elyon was worshipped in Jerusalem at one time, cf. A. R. Johnson, Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel, 2nd ed., pp. 47-53, 76ff. El Olam is the god of an El cult at Beersheba, cf. Clements, op. cit., p. 14; Frank M. Cross, Jr., "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," HTR, LV:232-41, 1962. See also Otto Eissfeldt, "El and Yahweh," JSS, I:25-37, 1956; idem, "Der Gott Bethel," Archiv für Religionswissenschaft, 28:1-30, 1930; Alt, op. cit., p. 51.

J uses the theophany in E, which represents the older tradition, to introduce and to interpret the two-fold blessing upon Jacob: the promise of land and a posterity (cf. Gen. 12:3ff.). Both of the promises were fulfilled when the Davidic dynasty gained control of the land of Palestine and began to cause its influence to be felt beyond the borders of Israel (cf. Gen. 28:14). J accepts the fact that an important sanctuary (perhaps a central sanctuary) once existed at Bethel and that the Bethel cult is to be accepted as authentic in the Yahwistic traditions (28:16).[217] The original promise which restricts the land to Bethel and its immediate vicinity was already present in the tradition to which J had access. The promise which is extended to Jacob is the promise God gave to Abraham in Genesis 12:3ff.; the result is that the Settlement of the land is connected with this blessing given to Jacob.

---

[216] Cf. Albrecht Alt, "Die Wallfahrt von Sichem nach Bethel," Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel, Vol. I, pp. 79-88.

In Genesis 35:9-13 the Priestly narrative neatly summarizes the theological interpretation of Genesis 28:10ff. (JE) and 32:23ff. (J), i.e., the promise of land and the change of name.[218] The change of name in the Priestly version is intended to assert the authority of Israel's god over the territory which was promised to Jacob. The promise of land is extended to include in the promise the descendants of Jacob contemporary with the P version. A tacit hope for a nation ruled by a Davidic king is hinted at in the promise of descendants to Jacob (35:11); however, before E can relate that Jacob set up a pillar at Bethel and held a cultic ceremony there, P must interject the note that God had already gone up from the place where Jacob had received the theophany. Apparently the founding of the cult at Bethel was not the central concern of P; moreover, the report of God's departure in Genesis may even be a castigation of the Bethel cult which had become paganized in P's eyes.

---

[217] Noth, History, p. 94, assumes that a central sanctuary existed at Bethel because the Ark is mentioned as being stationed there in Judg. 20:26f. (cf. 20:18; 21:2). Noth's suggestion presupposes that Gen. 28:13-16 reveals that the Ephraimitic kingdom was at peace with the Davidic dynasty.

[218] Von Rad, Genesis, pp. 333-34.

Behind the present narrative of Jacob at Bethel an independent tradition related the origin of the Bethel cult. The original tradition told how the El cult was merged with a nomadic cult of the tribes who settled in Bethel. Judges 1:22 indicates that the house of Joseph was responsible for the Hebrew settlement of Bethel, and the "Mighty One of Jacob" is remembered as an important epithet in connection with the house of Joseph (Gen. 49:24). "Related to this fact was the tradition of how the dying patriarch preferred Ephraim (in whose territory Bethel was situated) to Manasseh, although Manasseh was the first-born of Joseph."[219] These traditions were preserved by Josephite circles, a fact which explains why the E version (basically the northern view) contains the most original account of these traditions of Bethel.

Bethel was the local manifestation of the Canaanite El who was worshipped in the pre-Israelite system of worship at Bethel; nevertheless, the connection of the name Israel with Bethel is difficult to uncover.[220] Originally the name Israel was not related to Bethel; the only affinity between the cults of Bethel and Shechem was the kindred worship of an El deity. The Josephite group who settled Bethel merged their nomadic cult with the El cult of Bethel; however, the El cult was so strong that it brought the cult of the Mighty One of Jacob under its influence.[221] Thereupon, the Elohist, whose redaction probably began in the northern kingdom in the era of Jeroboam I, reported that Jacob built an altar at Bethel to authenticate the shrine as a legitimate shrine for the northern kingdom. Jacob is sent from Shechem to legitimize the cult at Bethel, and Shechem was Jeroboam's new capital of the kingdom of Israel (I Kgs. 12:25ff.).[222] However, Jeroboam's attempt to make a pure Yahwistic cult out of the El cult that had earlier fused with the cult of the nomadic settlers was short-lived, and the former dominance of the El cult soon reappeared at Bethel.[223]

---

[219] Nielsen, Shechem, p. 304.

---

[220] Noth, _loc. cit._, maintained that the name Israel accompanied the central shrine which was shifted from Shechem to Bethel, but Noth is at a loss then to explain why the central sanctuary was shifted to Bethel.

[221] Cf. Alt, "The God of the Fathers," p. 51.

[222] Otto Eissfeldt, "El and Yahweh," JSS, I:35-37, 1956, stated that the Yahweh cult which reached Canaan with the last immigration group found here the El cult in kindred groups and had to define its position in relation to the El cult. This merging of the El and Yahweh cults resulted in El being thought of as a revelation in the past of the God who later revealed his real name as Yahweh. Yahweh even took over the traits and El's function of Creator of the world and Suzerain over the cosmos, natural order, and moral order.

The fact that a pre-Davidic tradition connected Jacob with the founding of the Israelite cult at Bethel has caused the Yahwist to report that Abraham also established a cult at Bethel (Gen. 12:8; cf. 13:3). Since J was concerned that the promise of land be extended to the Davidic dynasty, the Yahwist restricted the promise to Jacob to the immediate territory of Bethel (Gen. 28:13).[224] As Jacob's descendants were the ones who extended the territory of the promise to Jacob, J identified these descendants as the Davidic dynasty. And since J is interested in emphasizing the Jerusalem cult, J does not identify the God of Jacob with the El cult, but simply refers to Jacob's God as "the God of Abraham your father and the God of Isaac" (28:13). An older tradition of Jacob governed the way J handled Jacob at Bethel; Abraham's association with Bethel may be an authentication of worship at Bethel during David and Solomon's reigns, although the Bible is silent on the story of Bethel during the United Monarchy.

---

[223] Later prophets severely censured the Bethel sanctuary (cf. I Kgs. 13:1-10; Amos 4:4; 5:5f.; Hos. 13:2).

[224] Cf. Seebass, _op_. _cit_., pp. 21-22.

Other West-Jordan Sites. Although Jacob is associated with Beersheba (Gen. 28:10, 46:1-5), his presence there is always connected with Isaac. Jacob is born at Beersheba because Isaac lived there; consequently, the journey of Jacob begins at Beersheba (Gen. 28:10), but the mention of Beersheba presents a certain roughness in the text's transition to Bethel. Jacob-Israel consulted the God of Isaac at Beersheba before he journeyed to Egypt (Gen. 46:1-5), but Jacob's attachment to the sanctuary at Beersheba depends heavily on Isaac's paternal relationship to Jacob.

Elijah fled to Beersheba because of the wrath of Jezebel (I Kgs. 19:3), and the prophecies of Amos imply that Beersheba was a place to which pilgrimages were made (Amos 5:5; cf. 8:14). These two northern prophets reflect a recognition of the Beersheba sanctuary in North Israel, but the biblical evidence is silent on what the relationship was between North Israel and Beersheba. Jacob's connection with Beersheba possibly is the result of the contact between the house of Joseph and the Leah tribes which can be traced back to the period of the Settlement. If a Leah confederacy which included tribes around Shechem, Beersheba, and southern Palestine, the contact of some of these Leah tribes (Simeon and Levi) with the Joseph tribes at Shechem afforded an opportunity for the Jacob tradition to be fused with the

Isaac tradition which was localized at Beersheba. This ancient connection between North Israel and Beersheba was preserved exclusively in the northern tradition circles and the destruction of North Israel (722 B.C.) resulted in only a vestige of this ancient relationship being preserved.

Two more West-Jordan traditions of Jacob are contained in Genesis 35. The burial of Rachel is connected with the birth-history of Benjamin (vv. 16-20). If the Rachel grave tradition was originally a part of the Jacob tradition,[225] this passage implies that Jacob and his wife Rachel are more at home in East-Jordan than in this West-Jordan setting. Notice that Rachel dies when she comes into the land of Canaan and is buried in the territory of Benjamin near Ramah (cf. I Sam. 10:2; Jer. 31:15).[226] Rachel is the wife Jacob loved in East-Jordan, but she is not buried in the traditional burial ground with Leah and Israel and the other patriarchs; she is buried in what later became Benjaminite territory. Ramah originally was in Josephite territory. A monument which paid tribute to Rachel still was known in the period of the E version.

---

[225] Alfred Jepsen, "Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Vätergestalten," Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität ("Gesellschafts-und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe"), Heft 2/3, 3:270, 1953-54, maintained that both the Rachel and Reuben traditions were combined with the Jacob history at a later time and are not Jacob traditions.

[226] Ephrath is not the same as Bethlehem, and later tradition circles found it necessary to explain it as Bethlehem each time it was used (Gen. 35:19; I Sam. 10:2; Ruth 4:11; Mic. 5:2). Psalm 132:6 equates this name with the territory of Ephraim. Ephrath was probably an older settlement in the territory of Ephraim (possibly in East-Jordan) which was later overshadowed by the prominence of the Ephrathite, David, and his connection with Bethlehem (I Sam. 17:2; Ruth 1:2). Cf. S. Cohen, "Ephrathah," IDB, Vol. E-J, p. 122.

The fragmentary note about the misdeed of Reuben at Migdal Eder (Gen. 35:21-22) is very obviously from an independent tradition, since the transition from the preceding section, and the transition to the following unit ". . . is more awkward than scarcely any other place in Genesis."[227] J has preserved a very ancient tradition of an attempt of Reuben to usurp the authority of Israel by taking his concubine.[228] Reuben's leadership and might were taken away because of this misdeed (Gen. 49:3-4), and Reuben was consigned to an unstable existence.

The history and geography of Reuben are not at all clear in the biblical records. One group of references seems to connect Reuben with West-Jordan (Judg. 5:15b-16); a place in the district south of Jericho was called "the stone of Bohan, the son of Reuben" (Josh. 15:6; 18:17). Joshua 7:1, 18 may indicate that Reubenites later joined the tribe of Judah, since Carmi is probably linked with Reubenites (Num. 26:6). Herzon was the son of Perez, Judah's son (Num. 26:6, 21), but Herzon is also the son of Reuben. Another group of references locate Reuben next to Gad in East-Jordan (Num. 32; Josh. 13:15-23).[229] Aharoni is willing to locate Eder in the Negeb and to identify it with Arad.[230]

---

[227] Von Rad, Genesis, p. 337.

[228] B. J. van der Merwe, "Joseph as Successor of Jacob," Studia Biblica et Semitica, "T. C. Vriezen Festschrift," pp. 221-32.

If a separate Israel patriarch had a parallel existence with Jacob, Genesis 35:21-22 derives from the cult of the separate Israel group. Notice that Genesis 35:20 refers to the patriarchal figure as Jacob; then, without any prior warning 35:21-22 shifts to the name Israel, only to have 35:23 return to Jacob. In the Israel traditions, Reuben is postulated as a leader of the Leah tribal league which existed in West-Jordan in the Bronze Age.[231] When Reuben attempted to assert his authority over the other Leah tribes (Gen. 35:21-22), the other Leah tribes banded together and banished the Reuben tribe from the Leah confederation (Gen. 49:3-4); thus, Israel was the patriarch of the Leah tribes. The splintered remains of Reuben were driven into the remote sections of southern Judah and the Negeb, while some of them escaped into East-Jordan where they gained strength by obtaining allies from groups of Amorites, Midianites, and others (cf. Josh 13). Here in East-Jordan the Reubenites came in contact with the Joseph tribes, with whom they either amalgamated or entered into confederation.[232]

---

[229] Noth, History, pp. 63-65.

[230] Yohanan Aharoni, The Land of the Bible: A Historical Geography, trans. by A. F. Rainey, p. 105. Eder may be a substitute for Arad in Josh. 15:21. Arad and Eder use the same Hebrew consonants and only require metathesis of the Daleth and Resh. The Codex Vaticanus of the LXX reads ʼαρα for Eder in Josh. 15:21.

[231] Cf. above, the hypothesis of an Israel group at Shechem.

Jepsen has a completely different explanation of Reuben. He thinks that Reuben was originally associated with the Settlement of East-Jordan and that the "Mighty One of Jacob" was worshipped by the Reuben group, along with his five brothers. Thus, the old Jacob tradition was preserved by this Reuben group, since Reuben is presented as the first-born of Jacob.[233] But Jepsen admits part of the weakness of his hypothesis when he remains puzzled over why the Leah tribes formed a unity, why Reuben is considered the first-born, and how Jacob is grafted into the house of Joseph.[234] Another of Jepsen's problems is that he has drawn his inferences from the later history of Reuben and has not considered an earlier existence of Reuben.

---

[232] Cf. G. E. Mendenhall, "The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine," BA, XXV:66-87, 1962, who maintained that social and political unrest in Palestine caused dissatisfied groups to "withdraw" to East-Jordan and the desert fringes where they later organized a campaign against West-Jordan. After reading this section Donald L. Williams suggested that the appearance of Benjamin's birth and Reuben's misdeed in the context of Gad may indicate that Benjamin, Reuben, and Gad formed an early three-tribe union which would have occurred after the Leah confederacy and before Joshua's Conquest of Canaan.

[233] Jepsen, _op_. _cit_., pp. 272-73.

If Reuben was once located in West-Jordan as a part of the Leah confederation which acknowledged Israel as their patriarch and El as their deity, the episode of Genesis 35:21-22 would not have belonged to the Jacob traditions originally. The reason for its fragmentary state in the present text is simply that the original tradition was either lost or suppressed. The misdeed of Reuben was clearly a pre-Yahwistic tradition that was preserved in the tradition circles of North Israel. Why the J traditionist included this fragment is hard to explain, unless the misdeed of Reuben was bound up with the birth of Benjamin. Genesis 35:21-22 could have been dislodged from its earlier mooring at the end of Genesis 34.

One other West-Jordan site is associated with Jacob in the biblical sources. Jacob is either assumed to be present, or is reported as being directly connected with the vicinity of Hebron (Gen. 35:19-20, 27-29; 37:14; 50:13). The Ephrath which was assumed to be Jacob's goal on his journey from Bethel was dealt with above as a separate place from Bethlehem (Gen. 35:16-20). The Priestly version noticed Jacob's intention to go in the direction of Bethlehem and transports Jacob to Hebron to be with Abraham and Isaac (Gen. 35:27). Jacob needs to be there for the burial of Isaac, but Jacob has no reason of his own for being there. Therefore, a later attempt to arrange the three patriarchs in a genealogical order is responsible for Jacob's presence at Hebron, and originally he was not present there.

---

[234] _Ibid_., p. 274.

Joseph is sent by his father from the valley of Hebron to inquire of the welfare of his brothers who are pasturing sheep in the region of Shechem and Dothan (Gen. 37:12, 14-J). Again, though, Israel is presented as the father of Joseph at Hebron, not Jacob. Notice that the brothers of Joseph show some affinity with Shechem and that Reuben is a spokesman for them, according to one version of the incident. The tribes of Leah are the ones who carried out this vile deed, and the incident occurred in the northern territory near Dothan. Thus, the presence of Israel at Hebron can best be explained as an episode in the traditions of the separate group of Israel.

A request of Jacob to be buried with his fathers (Gen. 47:29-31) is interpreted by P to mean that he would be buried at Machpelah near Hebron (Gen. 50:13). Perhaps, the burial of Jacob at Atad beyond Jordan was unacceptable to the audience of P. Nevertheless, Jacob was artificially attached to the vicinity of Hebron and was clearly not connected with Hebron in the old Jacob traditions. Hebron was Abraham's shrine, and only after Jacob was combined with Abraham could Jacob have been attached to Hebron.

Jacob and the House of Joseph

From the appearance of Jacob and Israel side by side in the same context (Gen. 35:20-23), Jepsen's suggestion that separate recensions of Jacob and Israel are detected in the Joseph history should not come as a great surprise.[235] Jepsen holds that the shifts from Jacob to Israel, Judah to Reuben, Ishmaelites to Midianites, and the sale of Joseph to the theft of Joseph can be explained by two different recensions of the Joseph history. The evidence of Genesis 35:21-22 would seem to support Jepsen's hypothesis of two recensions, but refutes his explanation of Reuben.

From the point at which Jacob received the name Israel in Genesis 35:10 to the end of the Joseph history, the appearances of Jacob and Israel are as follows:

---

[235] *Ibid.*, pp. 267-69. B. D. Eerdmans, *Die Komposition der Genesis*, Vol. I of "Alttestamentliche Studien," pp. 65-71, 82ff., analyzed the Joseph narrative and concluded that a Jacob-recension and an Israel-recension existed which were not coefficient with the J and E documentary analysis.

Israel	Jacob
	35:14 (E)
	35:15 (P)
35:21, 22, 22 (J)	
	35:23, 26, 27, 29; 36:6 (P)
	37:1, 2 (P)
37:3, 13 (J)	
	37:34 (E)
	42:1, 4 (J)
42:5 (E)	
	42:29, 36 (E)
43:6, 8, 11 (J)	
45:21 (E)	
	45:25, 26, 27 (E)
45:28 (E)	
46:1 (J)	
46:2 (E)	46:2 (E)
46:5 (E)	46:5, 5 (E)
46:8 (P)	46:6, 8, 15, 18, 19, 22, 25, 26, 26, 27 (P)
46:29, 30 (J)	
	47:7, 7, 8, 9, 10 (P)
47:27 (J)	
	47:28, 28 (P)

47:29, 31 (J)	
48:2 (J)	48:2, 3 (E)
48:8 (E)	
48:10 (J)	
48:11 (E)	
48:13, 13, 14 (J)	
48:20 (J)	
48:21 (E)	
	49:1 (P)
49:2 (J)	49:2 (J)
49:7 (J)	49:7 (J)
49:16 (J)	
49:24 (J)	49:24 (J)
49:28 (J)	
	49:33 (J)
50:2 (J)	
	50:24 (J)
50:25 (J)[236]	

Jacob occurs in Genesis 35:15 to 37:2 only in the Priestly version of the geneaological relation of Jacob to the other Israelite tribes. Israel enters the picture in Genesis 37:3 and assumes the character of the father of Joseph and his brothers; however, soon Joseph is disliked by his brothers because of Joseph's dream of having authority over Israel and the eleven brothers of Joseph. When Joseph goes to visit his brothers at Dothan, they conspire to kill him. Reuben intercedes for Joseph and persuades his brothers not to kill Joseph, but here a parallel is interjected that presents Judah as spokesman for the brothers (Gen. 37:25ff.). Judah wants to sell Joseph to a caravan of Ishmaelites who have come from Gilead. Then, without warning, the scene changes, and Midianite traders steal Joseph from the pit. Reuben discovers Joseph is gone and begins a mourning observance. When Joseph's fate is reported to his father (v. 34), Jacob is the one who enters into a state of lament for Joseph.

---

[236] Eerdmans, *ibid*., placed in the Israel-recension the following: Gen. 37:3-24, 28a, 29, 30-33, 36; 43-44; 45:28; 46:1, 2a, 28-34; 47:1-5, 13-27, 29-31; 48:1, 2b, 8-22; 50:1-11, 14-26. He assigned to the Jacob-recension the following: Gen. 37:2, 25-27, 28b, 34-35; 40-42; 45:1-27; 46:2b-7; 47:6-12, 28; 49:1a-29-33; 50:12-13.

If the traditional source designations are disregarded,[237] two separate recensions of this episode are observable in this narrative. The first recension is an Israel tradition that relates how Joseph assumed authority over Israel and his sons. When the sons of Israel conspire to kill Joseph in the territory of Dothan and Shechem, Reuben intercedes for Jacob, but Judah is able to persuade the other brothers to strip Joseph of his robe and sell him into slavery to the Ishmaelites, who in turn sell him to the Egyptians. This version of the story is related from a Jerusalem perspective; the point is made that Judah was the one who persuaded his brothers to sell Joseph into slavery to Egypt. Thus, Judah has a part, even though negative, in God's great act of Joseph's success in Egypt (cf. Gen. 50:20-21).

---

[237] Instead of looking for two sources, one should observe traces of two viewpoints of the reason why Joseph was once located in Egypt. Cf. von Rad, Genesis, p. 343.

The other recension in this story is the viewpoint of the house of Joseph. Joseph is assisted by Reuben, but Reuben does not prevent the Midianites from kidnapping Joseph and carrying him to Egypt. Reuben feels threatened because Joseph is gone, and Jacob mourns for the loss of his son. This version of the story gets Joseph in Egypt, but by the hands of the Midianites, not by Judah or the sons of Israel. This recension is more fragmentary and is probably older. Jacob is here the patriarch of the house of Joseph during a period when Reuben was co-existing in East-Jordan with the Midianites and a group of Josephites (cf. Josh. 13).[238]

---

[238] To accept this view, one must allow for more of a connection of the Joseph story with political history than von Rad is willing to assume. Cf. ibid., pp. 347, 428-29.

The Israel recension is found in the Yahwistic stratum, while the vestiges of the Jacob version are contained primarily in the Elohistic version.[239] J assumes that Israel's wife (Leah?) is still alive, but E had reported earlier that Rachel was dead (Gen. 35:18). The first dream of Joseph (Gen. 37:5-8, J) reflects agricultural practices of a culture of city-states similar to the Amarna Age; Joseph is pictured as a prince who has authority over other groups. Israel, also, is in a state of settled existence, and he sends men into the fields to pasture his flocks (37:12, 16). The pasturing of flocks in the regions of Shechem and Dothan would be in the vicinity of the places where Israel and the Leah tribal confederation were strongly attached (cf. Gen. 34, etc.). On the other hand, the Jacob version does not assume a settled culture; it reflects a more nomadic culture of shepherds and tribal disputes. An affinity of Reuben with Joseph is implied by the Jacob recension which could relate to East-Jordan history.

Jacob does not re-enter the drama until the narrator relates Joseph's rise to fame in Egypt; then, the scene shifts back to Palestine in order to pick up a transition in the theme of the story, i.e., Joseph's relationship to his brothers (Gen. 42, 43).[240] A famine brings the brothers to Egypt where they are finally re-united with their brother Joseph, but the brothers have to bow down before Joseph before they can get food.

---

[239] Cf. Gen. 45:5 (J), which refers back to 37:25-27, 28b (J). Also, 40:15 (E) refers back to 37:28a (E), and 42:22 (E) refers back to 37:22 (E). These cross-references are substantial.

Genesis 42 gives a slightly different viewpoint than do chapters 43 and 44. If chapter 42 is accepted as essentially Elohistic and chapters 42 and 43 are Yahwistic,[241] the Jacob and Israel recensions are again observable in these chapters. In the Jacob recension the sons of Israel are forced to go to Egypt because of a famine in Palestine. Jacob keeps Benjamin at home because he has a special status with Jacob; Benjamin is the brother of Joseph. The object of Joseph's accusation of the sons of Israel as spies is to get Benjamin to come to Egypt to be re-united with Joseph. The brothers confess that they saw Joseph in distress, but did not help when he entreated them. Reuben again speaks

---

[240] *Ibid*., p. 376.

[241] Julius Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testament*, 2nd ed., pp. 58ff., classified Gen. 42 as E and 43 and 44 as J. Von Rad, *op*. *cit*., pp. 376-77, accepted Wellhausen's analysis. The hand of J can be seen in 42:1-14, but E is the basic thread even here. Speiser, *Genesis*, p. 321, maintained that the compound, "sons of Israel," would be the prevailing ethnic connotation for a later editor and cannot be used as a documentary criterion.

speaks over against the misdeed of the brothers. One brother[242] is held hostage while the other brothers return to Jacob in Canaan. The brothers cannot return to Egypt without Benjamin. Reuben thereupon offers his two sons (cf. Gen. 46:9) as surety for the safety of Benjamin, but Jacob refuses to let Benjamin go.

The Israel recension (Gen. 43-44) also intends to get Benjamin to Egypt; thus, Israel consents to send Benjamin in the custody of Judah who suddenly appears as the spokesman of the brothers.[243] The brothers return to Egypt, and Benjamin is given a special status by Joseph. On their return journey to Palestine the brothers are apprehended, and Benjamin's welfare is at stake. Judah is compelled to offer himself as a substitute for Benjamin before Joseph reveals his true identity.

A comparison of the two recensions reveals the respective viewpoints which were observed in chapter 37. Benjamin, the new character in the Jacob recension, may allude to the connection of the house of Joseph with the kingdom of Saul, a Benjaminite. Unless Benjamin does have an ethnic allusion, the intense concern of the traditionists to locate Benjamin in Egypt is difficult to explain. Reuben has a respectable stance in the Jacob recension, as he did in chapter 37. The only references to cultural institutions in the Jacob recension are trade (42:34) and money, blood vengeance (vv. 21-22, 37), and spying (vv. 9, 11, etc.); these allusions are not sufficient to determine the cultural backdrop.

---

[242] The only reason apparent for Simeon to be chosen hostage is that he was next to the oldest of the sons of Leah. When the incident is retold to Jacob, the brothers reported that Joseph required them to leave "one of your brothers" (Gen. 42:33).

[243] Evidently, the Israel recension forgot that Simeon was being held as a hostage in Egypt, for the brothers wait until the grain supply is depleted before they return to Egypt.

The Jerusalem viewpoint can be observed in the fulfillment of Joseph's earlier dreams concerning the sons of Israel bowing to Joseph (42:9; cf. 37:5-10), which is a later addition of the Jacob recension to connect the tribes of Israel with God's blessing of Joseph in Egypt. Chapters 43 and 44 show signs of having been preserved in the Jerusalem context. The telling evidence is in the heroic position which Judah takes in pleading for the release of Benjamin by substituting himself (44:18ff.). In this recension Israel does not refuse to send Benjamin to Egypt if this would get them food (43:11). The presents to be sent to Joseph are in the Israel recension and presuppose an agriculturally based economy (Gen. 43:11); this kind of culture would be expected in an urban setting, not in a more nomadic way of life.

Genesis 45:1-14 is a combination of the Israel and

Jacob recensions; the recognition scene was reported from the two viewpoints which are mentioned above, but only the Jerusalem perspective is clearly distinguishable in the present text. This view is perceived in the indication by the narrator that ultimately it was not the hate of the brothers but God who brought Joseph to Egypt in order to preserve the people who would become the nation of Israel (Gen. 45:5-7).[244]

The Jacob recension may be attested in the latter section of this chapter (45:15-27). Pharaoh suggests that Joseph should send a caravan back to Palestine to transport Jacob and his household to Egypt where they eat from the fat of the land. Joseph cautions the brothers not to quarrel on their way back to Palestine (v. 24); this warning may allude to the tension revealed earlier between Reuben and the other brothers, although no mention is made of Reuben. This section reaches a climax with the report to Jacob that Joseph was still alive.

A transitional section (Gen. 45:28-46:5) contains a fusion of the two recensions, and the present text almost defies a delineation of the two recensions. The Israel recension observed difficulty with Israel going to Egypt, for Israel indicates that knowing that Joseph is alive is enough for the time being; Israel would go to see Joseph before he died, but he was not in any hurry to go to Egypt. A theophany of the El cult (46:3) at Beersheba removed the hesitation.[245] Traces of a Jacob recension are present in this section, but what the Jacob viewpoint was is no longer clear.

---

[244] Von Rad, Genesis, p. 393.

The practical consideration of the location of Israel and his household is acknowledged by the Israel recension (Gen. 46:28-47:31, except P additions). In this passage Judah is singled out as the spokesman of the Israelites (cf. 43:3ff.; 44:18ff.). The Israel recension located the Israelites in the land of Goshen, the land which was closest to the land of promise. When the time comes for Israel's death, he cannot be buried in Egypt so Joseph must swear that he will carry Israel out of Egypt and bury him with his fathers. The basis of Israel's request was connected with the assurance of the deliverance of Israel from Egypt.

A fragment of the Jacob recension is attested in Genesis 48:1-2. Very likely, this recension once related the blessing of the house of Joseph by their father Jacob, and the house of Joseph which was to be blessed was composed of Manasseh and Ephraim during the period of the

---

[245] Cf. above, the discussion of Jacob's connection with Beersheba.

Judges (cf. Josh. 17:17; 18:5; Judg. 1:27, 29; 5:14; Num. 1:5-15; 26:5-51). The order of Manasseh and Ephraim reflects a tradition that recognized Manasseh as stronger than Ephraim.

However, the Israel recension is quick to point out that Ephraim had politically surpassed Manasseh (48:8-22).[246] The ordeal of reversing the blessing is made possible by the dim sight of Jacob (48:10), but the purpose of the reversal is revealed in the prophecy of Jacob that Ephraim would be greater than Manasseh (48:19-20). Obviously, the traditionist has reference to the historical fact of the political strength of the northern tribes. The Jacob recension may lie behind the Israel recension, but J and P have concealed any traces of the Jacob recension which may have been observable. The interest of the Israel recension clearly is exposed when Israel is viewed as a national entity for the first time (48:20; the reference in 34:7 is anachronistic);[247] moreover, a continuity is established between Jacob's pronouncement of blessing and the nation Israel being the recipient of blessing. The house of Joseph becomes the medium of Israel's possession of blessing, a blessing interpreted as Settlement in the land of promise where Israel grows into a mighty nation (cf. 48:21).

---

[246] These verses which usually are ascribed to E can just as easily be attributed to J. The text is mixed, but an Israel recension can be postulated as the basic viewpoint of this section. Cf. John Skinner, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis, "The International Critical Commentary," 2nd ed., p. 503, who maintained that "Israel" should be deleted as a "redactional explication" in vv. 2b (?), 8, 11, and 21.

[257] Von Rad, Genesis, p. 413.

The strange allusion to the assignment of Shechem to the house of Joseph is not found elsewhere in the traditions. "The assumption seems unavoidable that a tradition is contained in these verses, which does not place this whole proceeding in Egypt but in Palestine."[248] This fragment of the Jacob recension is definitely from the perspective of the house of Joseph and is intended to assert this group's authority over this region. Jacob's conquest of Shechem by the sword probably relates to an alliance between Shechem and the house of Joseph which was effected (cf. Judg. 9:45, etc.).

Jacob's burial in East-Jordan (50:10-11) is a final fragment of the Jacob recension which is readily apparent.[249] The Israel recension has reinterpreted the death and burial of Jacob and Joseph in Genesis 50:1-9, 12-26. The brothers' sin against Joseph is nullified by explaining that God turned their misconduct into a blessing for all of Israel (50:20-21). Thus, Israel is brought into a favorable relationship to the house of Joseph; the stage is set for Israel to be a part of God's deliverance of the house of Joseph from Egypt and for Israel to be included in the fulfillment of the promise to Jacob when the land of Palestine is settled by the Joseph tribes (cf. 50:24).

---

[248] _Ibid_., p. 414.

[249] Cf. above, the connection of Jacob with Atad beyond Jordan.

The Israel recension offers a clue to the intention of the whole Joseph narrative: the Joseph narrative serves to underscore the relationship between the United Kingdom of Israel under David and Solomon and the northern tribes. Thus, the Joseph history is a bridge for Israel between the Jacob narratives, which are told primarily from the perspective of the house of Joseph, and the thread of salvation history which begins to be exposed in the Exodus experience.[250] On the other hand, the Jacob recension of the Joseph history is more fragmentary and reflects a viewpoint which would be suitable among the traditions of the house of Joseph in the north. Thus, the literary analysis of the Joseph history strongly suggests that the Joseph tribes preserved elements of the Jacob tradition.

---

[250] Cf. S. H. Hooke, "Genesis," Peake's, p. 198. If the Israel recension of the Joseph history is the viewpoint of the court sages of David and Solomon from Jerusalem, the emphasis on wisdom in the Joseph history is practically explained. Cf. also, von Rad, "The Joseph Narrative and Ancient Wisdom," The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, trans. by E. W. Trueman Dicken, pp. 292-300; R. N. Whybray, "The Joseph Story and Pentateuchal Criticism," VT, XVIII:522-28, 1968.

A study of the sites at which the Jacob tradition is connected reveals that the area where the Jacob tradition thrived is also the area settled by the house of Joseph.[251] The house of Joseph included the East-Jordan territory of Gilead (Josh. 17:1; Num. 26:29) and the Central Highlands of East- and West-Jordan (Josh. 16-17; Judg. 1:22-29; Num. 1:32-35; 36:1-13; Deut. 33:13-17; Gen. 49:22-26). Jacob was associated with the sanctuary of Shechem because this sanctuary was an important shrine for the Manassites. Ephraim's cultic center was once located at Bethel, a shrine with which the Jacob tradition was connected. The sites of Penuel, Mahanaim, Succoth, Mizpah, and Atad, which were situated in East-Jordan, all fall within the territory of Machir, Gilead, or the half-tribe of Manasseh, i.e., in the house of Jacob.

An Ephraimite by the name of Joshua is reported to have settled the Central Highlands, entering Canaan from the east. If Noth is correct, the promise of land which was received originally by Jacob in the house of Joseph, was brought into the pentateuchal structure because of

---

[251] Albrecht Alt, "The God of the Fathers," Essays on Old Testament History and Religion, trans. by R. A. Wilson, pp. 51-52.

Jacob's recognition among the central Palestinian tribes and because of Jacob's association with the Settlement tradition.[252] Thus, the promise of land must have been an original part of the Jacob tradition and was associated with the Settlement tradition in the house of Joseph (cf. Deut. 26:5; Josh. 24; I Sam. 12:8; Psalm 105).[253] The J version reinterpreted the promise of land to show that the extension of the borders of the Davidic kingdom was the fulfillment of the patriarchal promise which now included all three patriarchs, and all the tribes could then acknowledge Jacob as patriarch.

Manasseh has two points in its favor as the group which preserved the older form of the Jacob tradition. For one thing, Manasseh is the first-born of Joseph and consequently was the strongest tribe of the house of Joseph before Ephraim gained the dominant position. The second reason for Jacob being preserved in the tribe of Manasseh is the fact that most of the sites which are associated with Jacob are located in the territory of the house of Manasseh (Machir, Gilead, Manasseh, and the half-tribe of Manasseh). However, Manasseh did not have exclusive possession of the Jacob tradition. The central and northern regions of East-Jordan were composed of a mixed population prior to the Settlement, and Jacob was recognized among East-Jordan tribes before the Manassites settled this territory. The Jacob tradition was the common property of the sanctuaries of Mahanaim, Penuel, Mizpah, Succoth, and possibly Atad; moreover, Jacob was a hero-type of the shepherds of this region prior to its settlement by the house of Manasseh.

---

[252] History, p. 125.

[253] Von Rad, "Problem of the Hexateuch," pp. 54-63. Cf. Deut. 26:5; Josh. 24; I Sam. 12:8.

A younger form of the Jacob tradition was formed by the merger of the Manassites and Ephraimites into the house of Joseph.[254] When the territory of the Jacob tradition on both sides of the Jordan is surveyed, a great similarity exists between the territory of the Jacob tradition and the territory of the kingdom of Saul.[255] When Abner crowned the son of Saul, Ishbosheth, over the kingdom of Israel at Mahanaim, the area regarded as the kingdom of Saul was

---

[254] Alfred Jepsen, "Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Vätergestalten," Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität ("Gesellschafts-und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe"), 3:268, 1953-54, suggested that the Ephraimitic form of the Jacob tradition was developed in the time of Solomon. A more plausible time would be during the era of Saul when the northern kingdom was being solidified.

[255] G. Wallis (Gemeinschaftsarbeit), "Die Geschichte der Jakobtradition," Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität ("Gesellschafts-und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe"), XIII:438, 1964.

Gilead, Asher, Jezreel (capital of Issachar), Ephraim (including Manasseh and the whole house of Joseph), and Benjamin (cf. Judg. 1; II Sam. 2:9).[256] Although the locations of Mizpah and Mahanaim in the narratives of Saul are not certain, they were connected earlier with the Manassites and before that were associated with the Jacob tradition. That the Jacob tradition was preserved in the tribes of the house of Joseph in East-Jordan during the pre-Settlement period is the conclusion drawn from the evidence above.

Summary

A summary of the transmission of the Jacob tradition up to the Davidic monarchy is now in order. The Jacob tradition entered Palestine from the North-West Semitic area through the agency of migrating Amorite or Aramean groups of shepherds. Whether the Jacob tradition reached the East-Jordan region by way of West-Jordan tribes who were forced out of the West-Jordan area by the Egyptian expulsion of the Hyksos or were part of the Habiru movement is not clear; nevertheless, the Jacob tradition was domiciled in the East-Jordan area prior to the Settlement of Palestine under Joshua. The Jacob tradition existed in East-Jordan during this early period as campfire stories which were told of shepherd heroes, although one may doubt that Jacob's name was attached to all of these stories. Out of the mixed population of East-Jordan emerged a group who had escaped from Egyptian slavery and who had established a relationship with a deity. A common loyalty to the God of Jacob[257] created a community which identified itself in terms of a figure Jacob who had experienced the revelation of the deity. The figure Jacob attracted local traditions and shepherd stories and thereby became the patriarch of the East-Jordan region.[258] Those who recognized the God of Jacob merged with elements of what later became the house of Manasseh (possibly Machir, Gilead, or Manasseh itself); thus, the Jacob tradition was brought into contact with an Israelite group at Shechem through an alliance between Manasseh and an El-worshipping group of Canaanites.

---

[256] Albrecht Alt, "The Settlement of the Israelites in Palestine," Essays on Old Testament History and Religion, trans. by R. A. Wilson, p. 161.

The alliance between Ephraim and Manasseh brought

---

[257] The name of Jacob's god could have been the "Bull" of Jacob, the "Mighty One" of Jacob, or "the god Jacob." The name of Jacob's god was not nearly so important as what his God did for those who recognized Jacob as their father.

[258] G. E. Mendenhall, "The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine," BA, XXV:73ff., 1962, described the Israelite Settlement of East-Jordan as resulting from an escaped slave group who formed a relationship with the deity Yahweh. This group attracted other clans and tribes into a solidarity of covenant obligations between Yahweh and his people and moved back into West-Jordan where they took control of the Central Highlands.

Jacob into contact with the Bethel cult, but the time at which the Jacob tradition was fused with the El cult of El Bethel is not clear. One conjecture is that the Shechem group sided with remnants of the Leah tribes who were being organized into the house of Judah under David (cf. II Sam. 3:2-5), for Shechem is not mentioned after Abimelech destroyed it (Judg. 9:57)[259] until Rehoboam went there to be crowned king (I Kgs. 12:1; cf. 12:25).[260] As the central shrine of the tribe of Ephraim, which was dominating the hill country of central Palestine, Bethel accepted the Manassites who withdrew from Shechem and brought the Jacob tradition into the Bethel cult, but the Jacob tradition did not achieve a prominent position at Bethel until the days of Jeroboam I.

Firmly imbedded in the traditions of the house of Joseph, the Jacob tradition continued to play a significant part in the kingdom of Saul, who was a Benjaminite. Jacob's preservation in the house of Joseph also brought the Jacob tradition into contact with Shiloh and Gilgal sanctuaries where Jacob was in contact with the Settlement tradition and the promise of land and the tradition of the Ark and the idea of election. Thus, Jacob is the patriarch of the northern tribes at the death of Saul, and the Jacob tradition is intricately woven into the faith and history of the house of Joseph.

---

[259] Shechem is mentioned in Judg. 21:19, but only in locating Shiloh north and east of a road that went from Bethel to Shechem.

[260] Cf. Alt, loc. cit.

CHAPTER III

THE JACOB TRADITION AND JUDAH

CHAPTER III

THE JACOB TRADITION AND JUDAH

Since the Jacob tradition was preserved among the northern tribes before the rise of the monarchy and Jacob was a patriarch in the house of Joseph, this chapter will trace the transfer of the Jacob tradition from the northern tribes to Judah and will observe the significance which the Jacob tradition had among the traditions of Jerusalem. The Jacob tradition appears in at least four different kinds of literature which is connected with the cult of Jerusalem. The J stratum of the Pentateuch assumes a Jerusalem perspective in the Jacob stories, as was seen in the preceding chapter. Both the historical literature of Judah and the Jerusalem oriented psalms contain references to the Jacob tradition. A somewhat later reflection of the Jacob tradition is present in the work of some of the prophets who were associated with Jerusalem. Thus, the history of the Jacob tradition in Judah can be observed during three crucial stages of the development of traditions in Judah: (1) the development and adaptation of traditions for the United Monarchy; (2) the coloring of the separation of the ten northern tribes; and (3) the reinterpretation of the traditions in light of the Exile.

A. THE JACOB TRADITION AND THE UNITED MONARCHY

Jacob's acceptance into the store of Judean traditions can be attributed to circumstances and influences associated with the reigns of David and Solomon. A change in the political structure which occurred during the United Monarchy provided the opportunity for the Jacob tradition to be fused with the Davidic traditions. This process of fusion can be observed in the literature that is attributed to the influence of the establishment of the house of David; therefore, one can expect to find connections between Jacob and the significance of David in the traditions of Judah. If the Jacob tradition contributed to the political and religious achievements of David, one should be able to observe evidence of David's contribution to the preservation of the Jacob tradition in the southern kingdom.

Historical Connection between Jacob and David

The acceptance of the northern tradition of Jacob by the southern tribes of Judah was a direct result of the political shrewdness of David. When Saul was slain by the Philistines, David was able to gather around him a group of tribes who wanted to separate themselves from the northern kingdom of Saul, and these dissatisfied tribes probably united with some southern tribes around Hebron and formed the house of Judah. The establishment of the house of Judah appears to have been built entirely around David's person.[1] Through a series of diplomatic moves David was able to win the allegiance of the northern kingdom and finally was crowned king of both Israel and Judah (II Sam. 5:3). David used every device available to him to unite the tribes into an organized state, with himself serving as king, the sole leader of the monarchy.[2]

David worked diligently to create a close association between his political dynasty and Israel's religion. Choosing a representative of the old Shiloh priesthood, Abiathar (I Kg. 2:27; cf. I Sam. 2:27-36), as a high priest in the cult of the United Monarchy was a diplomatic gesture toward the northern tribes. The exile of Abiathar was interpreted by the Deuteronomic Historian (I Kgs. 2:27) as a fulfillment of the words spoken concerning the house of Eli (I Sam. 2:27-36). The Nob priesthood is implied to be descended from the house of Eli and is the guardian of the Ark which was located at Shiloh. Whereas Saul had slaughtered the priests of Nob, David remained on good terms with them (I Sam. 22:13). Walther Eichrodt has noted that David observed that the priesthood was sociologically related to the monarchy and that the influence of the priesthood was indispensable to his goal of a unified kingdom; therefore, David made sure that the priesthood had an important part in his religious program, on several occasions exercising priestly functions himself (II Sam. 6:13, 7).[3]

---

[1] Albrecht Alt, "The Formation of the Israelite State in Palestine," _Essays on Old Testament History and Religion_, trans. by R. A. Wilson, pp. 212-13.

[2] Cf. John Bright, _A History of Israel_, pp. 174ff. (hereafter, Bright, _History_), for a treatment of the political moves of David.

Another group, the prophets, was considered to be important in David's plan of making the constitutional and domestic foundations of the monarchy as secure as possible. Even during Saul's lifetime the prophet, Samuel, anointed David in the name of Yahweh. He depended on the prophets for advice, and the prophets believed that they could trust this man upon whom the Spirit of Yahweh had come (cf. I Sam. 16:13). David himself is portrayed as an inspired seer in the so-called Last Words of David (II Sam. 23: 1ff.). The prophets denied David the privilege of building a temple for the Ark (II Sam. 7) and reproved David for his sins (II Sam. 12 and 24); nevertheless, David determined to keep the prophetic circles on the side of the king. The prophets rewarded David's respect for them by bestowing divine approval upon his achievements and by disclosing a divine promise that his dynasty was everlasting (II Sam. 7).[4]

---

[3] _Theology of the Old Testament_, trans. by J. A. Baker, Vol. I, p. 446.

The selection of Jerusalem for a new capital was ideal because it was politically neutral for both Judah and Israel. Not long after David had established himself in Jerusalem, he transferred the sacred Ark of the northern tribes to the new capital in Jerusalem. The transfer of the Ark to Jerusalem christened the city of David as the pilgrimage center for all of the northern tribes.[5] "It was David's aim to make Jerusalem the religious as well as the political capital of the realm."[6] H. J. Kraus stated that the installation of the Ark in the city of David elevated Jerusalem to the status of an amphictyonic culture center and brought the ancient Israelite traditions and institutions of the tribal confederacy to the "chosen place."[7]

Once the Ark was present in Jerusalem an official cult which embraced the whole tribal union could be brought into being. The new cult was based upon the assumptions and regulations of the older cults of Israel and Judah.[8] Thus, the older traditions of Israel and Judah became the raw materials for the development of a new cult which had to deal with the explanation of the kingship and the status of David and Jerusalem in the new political situation in the United Monarchy.

---

[4] Ibid., p. 447.

[5] Delbert R. Hillers, Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea, "Seminars in the History of Ideas," p. 100. Cf. Bright, History, pp. 179f.

[6] Bright, op. cit., p. 179.

[7] Worship in Israel, trans. by Geoffrey Bushwell, p. 182 (hereafter, Kraus, Worship). Cf. Martin Noth, "Jerusalem and the Israelite Tradition," The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies, trans. by D. R. Ap-Thomas, pp. 132-44.

To know for certain what occasioned the Yahwistic version of the Pentateuch is impossible, but that J resulted from the profound transformation of a loose confederation of independent tribes in the period of the Judges into an organized and powerful kingdom in the time of David and Solomon is reasonable to believe.[9] Probably the intention of J was ". . . to establish the place of the theocratic kingdom and the Davidic dynasty in God's plan for the salvation of the world."[10] As the previous chapter has noted, J reveals an obvious interest in things pertaining to the house of Judah. For J, Hebron is a very old Israelite shrine in Judah (cf. Gen. 13:14-18; 18-19); Judah is the hero of the Joseph narrative (Gen. 37:26; 43:1-12; 44:14-34; 46:28); and Judah was an ancestor of David (cf. Gen. 38:29 and Ruth 4:18-22). J has used the narrative device of foreshadowing to inject into the traditions of the Judges (references to the royal power to be centered in Judah [cf. Gen. 49:8-12; Num. 24:7, 17]). J has interpreted the older traditions from the viewpoint of Jerusalem in Judah.

---

[8] Ibid.

[9] Gerhard von Rad, "The Problem of the Hexateuch," The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, trans. by E. W. Trueman Dicken, p. 72 (hereafter, von Rad, "Problem of the Hexateuch"), noted that the immense development of the ancient creed by J is much more directly related to David than has hitherto been supposed.

[10] Peter F. Ellis, The Men and the Message of the Old Testament, p. 84. Cf. R. E. Clements, Abraham and David: Genesis XV and Its Meaning for Israelite Tradition, "Studies in Biblical Theology," Second Series, No. 5, p. 16 (hereafter, Clements, Abraham and David), "The Yahwist's purpose was to show the divine providence which brought into being

Similarities between the Court History of David (II Sam. 9-I Kgs. 2) and J indicate that these two bodies of tradition have come from the same literary circles.[11] J probably was commissioned to work up a "court theology" to interpret the divine significance of the choice of David as king and the selection of Jerusalem as the royal capital.[12] That the dynasty of David was not an accident but a part of Yahweh's plan and that Jerusalem was the

---

the Davidic Kingdom, by which Israel became a nation, and took possession of the land of Canaan."

[11] Ibid., pp. 82-83.

[12] Noth, op. cit., p. 135, suggested that a "court theology" may have explained that Yahweh had chosen David and Jerusalem.

place from which Yahweh would rule the world is paralleled in the theological interpretation of Israel's history by J. Thus, J could take the traditions of Jacob, interpret them, show their inner relation and inner dynamic, arrange them in the framework of the history of Israel, and theologize on them to reveal new and deeper knowledge of Yahweh's purpose for Israel and for the world.[13] Yet, J could not change the traditions themselves, for the unwavering memory of tradition remained as a check against changing these traditions which were vital to the religion of the northern tribes.

The transfer of the Jacob tradition from the northern tribes of Joseph to the house of Judah must have taken place during the time when a strong political union existed between Israel and Judah. Only during the period of the United Monarchy can such a political union be shown to have existed, for before and after the reigns of David and Solomon the northern tribes lived separately from the southern tribes.[14] Evidence of this fusion of Jacob and the Judean traditions should be observable in the Judean traditions which contain the Jacob tradition. The historical connections between Jacob and Jerusalem during the United

---

[13] Ellis, op. cit., p. 86.

[14] Cf. Alt, op. cit., pp. 205-37.

Monarchy accord with the conclusion that the Jacob tradition was brought into the Jerusalem cult under the influence of David.

Cultic Connection between Jacob and David

That the Jacob tradition should appear in some of the traditions of Judah is not surprising since Israel and Judah were united under David and Solomon; however, that Jacob is fused with the primary themes of the Davidic theology is very significant. Although the Jacob traditions were interpreted in light of the ideals of the Davidic kingdom, traces and elements of the Jacob traditions are still visible among these basic themes of the United Monarchy.

Jacob and the Election of Jerusalem

After David had established Jerusalem as the new capital of Israel and Judah, the task facing the king was that of developing a cult that would be acceptable to the whole kingdom. However, before David could establish an official cult, the city of Jerusalem had to be authorized as a proper place for a sanctuary. Israel would not easily desert her shrines at Bethel, Dan, Gilgal, Shiloh, etc.[15]

---

[15] Shechem is nowhere mentioned in connection with the United Kingdom. Shechem is not mentioned from the time of its destruction by Abimelech (Judg. 9:57) until Rehoboam is crowned king there (I Kgs. 12:1). The psalms which mention Jacob associate him with Shiloh, but never with Shechem.

Therefore, David transferred the Ark which had rested at Shiloh in the days of Samuel (I Sam. 3:3; 4:3) to show that the cultic history of Jerusalem was connected with Shiloh. Several clues suggest that the Jacob tradition accompanied the Ark's transfer to Jerusalem and that the purpose of accepting the Jacob tradition in Jerusalem was related to David's plan to make Jerusalem the place of worship for all the tribes of the dual kingdom of Israel and Judah.

The God who appears as King of Mount Zion is "Yahweh of Hosts," a special epithet for the God of the tribes who had worshipped at Shiloh (I Sam. 1:3, 11).[16] In Psalms 46: 7, 11 and 84:8, "Yahweh of Hosts" is the parallel of "the God of Jacob." In a psalm that culticly dramatized the bringing of the Ark into Jerusalem,[17] Yahweh's entrance into his temple is connected with the theophany which Jacob had received (Psalm 24); the God who is acclaimed ruler of the temple in Jerusalem is the God of the Ark, Yahweh of Hosts (24:10). In the group of Asaph Psalms (73-83), the house of Joseph and the covenant people of Jacob are firmly attached to traditions of the Ark at Shiloh. In Psalm 78, the election of the house of Joseph begins in Egypt and is consummated at Shiloh; when the Ephraimites did not keep God's covenant (78:9-10), Yahweh kindled a fire against Jacob and raised his anger against Israel (v. 21).

---

[16] Kraus, Worship, pp. 213-14. Cf. idem, Psalmen, "Biblischer altes Testament," Vol. I, pp. 197-205.

[17] Cf. Hermann Gunkel and Joachim Begrich, Einleitung in die Psalmen, "Handkommentar zum alten Testament," pp. 323ff.; H. H. Rowley, Worship in Ancient Israel, p. 180; R. E. Clements, God and Temple, pp. 74ff.

If David could convince the northern tribes that the God of Jacob had "chosen" Jerusalem as the new home of the Ark, the Israelites would make regular pilgrimages to the new religious capital. This attempt to convince the Israelites may be related to the solemn celebration of the event of the election of Jerusalem as a worship experience (Psalm 132).[18] David is reported to have vowed to the "Mighty One of Jacob" (Psalm 132:2, 5). If אֲבִר ("strong, mighty") refers to the "Bull of Jacob,"[19] this psalm could be associated with the calf-worship at Bethel which took place under Jeroboam I (I Kgs. 12:25ff.; cf. Num. 24:8 and Hos. 8:5-6, 10:5). The Mighty One of Jacob then would be an epithet of the God of the house of Joseph (Gen. 49:24). Otto Eissfeldt holds that Ephratha~~t~~h (Psalm 132:6) is a poetical reference to Ephraim, and its parallel in Psalm 132:6 is Jaor, a poetical variant of Kiriath-Jearim.[20] Thus, an attempt is made in Psalm 132 to show that the transfer of the Ark, symbol of Yahweh's presence to the northern tribes, authenticated the sanctuary of the Davidic dynasty as a place where Yahweh was also present.

---

[18] Cf. Aage Bentzen, "The Cultic Use of the Story of the Ark in Samuel," JBL, LXVII:37-53, 1948; Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Kiriath-Jearim and the Ark," JBL, LXXXVIII:143-56, 1969; D. R. Hillers, "Ritual Procession of the Ark and Ps. 132," CBQ, 30:48-55, 1968; Kraus, Worship, pp. 183-88; J. R. Porter, "The Interpretation of II Sam. 6 and Ps. 132," JTS, 5:161-73, 1954. R. E. Clements, "Deuteronomy and the Jerusalem Cult Tradition," VT, XV:305ff., 1965, argued that the origin of "choose" as election terminology can be traced to the ideology of the Davidic monarchy in Jerusalem. Cf. E. W. Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition, pp. 96ff.

[19] Cf. Bruce Vawter, "Canaanite Background of Genesis 49," CBQ, XVII:1-18, 1955; Ivan Engnell, Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East, 2nd ed., p. 200; Henri Frankfort, Kingship and the Gods, pp. 162-63; O. R. Gurney, The Hittites, 2nd ed., pp. 66, 141; G. E. Wright, Biblical Archaeology, abridged ed., p. 92.

Jacob and the Election of David

The Jacob tradition also can be shown to be related to the election of David in Jerusalem. The relationship between David and God is described as a "covenant" (II Sam. 23:5). Jacob represented a covenant tradition which antedated David's covenant; thus, to show that the dynasty of David was of the same covenant tradition as was Jacob would contribute to Israel's acceptance of David (cf. Psalms 20 and 132). The same God who had settled Jacob in Palestine is the God who had established the Davidic dynasty (Psalm 47). The "heritage," or inheritance, of Jacob is the parallel of "the pride of Jacob" (Psalm 47:4); Jacob's pride is his possession of the land of Canaan (cf. Gen. 12:1-13; 35:12). Psalm 105 explains that the "everlasting covenant" with David was begun with Abraham (Gen. 13:1-3) and was fulfilled in the giving of the land to Jacob. "David's theologians" would point out that the expansion of the Davidic kingdom was the real fulfillment of the promise of land to Jacob.[21] The kingship ideology which David probably borrowed from Jebusite Jerusalem has been fused with a covenant loyalty which is represented by Jacob; Elyon's supremacy over Canaanite Jerusalem was related to Jacob's inheritance of the land (Psalm 47:1-4). In Psalm 99, a moral stability which was localized in "Jacob" was to be continued in the house of David through a covenant renewal ceremony like that of the tribal confederacy at Shiloh (Psalm 99:4-5). Yahweh's choice of the Davidic dynasty is held in tension with the revelation of Yahweh's character through the covenantal relationship of Yahweh to Jacob (Psalm 99; cf. Psalm 24).[22]

---

[20] "Psalm 132," _Die Welt des Orient_, II:480-83, 1959.

Doubtless, David was quite willing to accept the Jacob tradition into the Jerusalem cult if the Jacob tradition could draw the northern tribes closer to the Davidic monarchy. Although all of these psalms are not to be attributed to David, the influence of David's policies is clearly imprinted upon the system of worship reflected in these psalms which contain the Jacob tradition.

---

[21] Clements, Abraham and David, p. 57, is confident that the primary theme of the Yahwistic epic is a promise of land which was historically fulfilled when the tribes settled Palestine.

[22] Harvey H. Guthrie, Jr., Israel's Sacred Songs, pp. 106, 109.

Yahwistic Connection between Jacob and David

If the contention that the Yahwistic school began writing against the background of the United Monarchy is correct,[23] evidence of a connection between Jacob and David may be expected in the Yahwistic account of the Jacob tradition. The subtle allusions to the Davidic kingdom can be observed in J's attempt to relate the traditions of the patriarchs to the history of God's salvation of his people Israel.

Historical Allusions

J betrays a presupposition of the organized state of Israel in several places where the Jacob tradition occurs.

---

[23] Cf. *ante*, n. 9. Sigmund Mowinckel, "Erwagungen zur Pentateuchquellenfrage," *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift*, 65:55, 1964, referred to the Yahwistic epic as a *Hofhistoriograph*, "Court-History." "Und wenn J seine Saga mit einer Übersicht über die Landnahme abgeschlossen hat, so kann kein Zweifel darüber bestehen, dass er Jahwes Plan mit Israel in dem nationalen davidischen Königtum typisch realisiert sah; die Hindeutungen auf die Herrlichkeit des Davidreiches bei J dürfen nicht übersehen werden" (p. 56). Cf. Gen. 49:10; Num. 24:17-19; also see Gen. 13:17; 12:2; 15:18-21; 22:17; 26:4; 28:14; Ex. 23:31; 34:10; Num. 24:7f.

At the very beginning of the Jacob narratives, two nations are struggling in Rebekah's womb. As noted in the preceding chapter, the Yahwistic account of this struggle between Jacob and Esau is an ethnological allusion to the struggle and conquest of Edom by the Davidic monarchy (II Sam. 8:13-14). The birth of Jacob's eleven sons (Gen. 29:31-30:24) certainly assumes the pattern of the twelve tribes of Israel who were finally united under the monarchy of David. This twelve-tribe pattern is reflected in the report concerning the formation of Solomon's twelve administrative districts (I Kgs. 4:7-19). Although the corrupt nature of the text of verse 19 obscures the place of Judah in this reorganization of the kingdom, each tribal district in Solomon's system must have had a connection with an older tribal system, since the tribes were older than the kingdom of Solomon.[24] The effect which these administrative districts of Solomon had on J's naming of Jacob's sons remains to be explored; note here is taken that the names of the districts are not the same as the names of the twelve tribes of Israel, suggesting that J gave the sons of Jacob their present names in order to try to unify the kingdom.

---

[24] Albrecht Alt, "The Settlement of the Tribes in Palestine," Essays on Old Testament History and Religion, trans. by R. A. Wilson, p. 164. Cf. F. M. Cross and G. E. Wright, "The Boundary and Province Lists of the Kingdom of Judah," JBL, LXXV:202-26, 1956.

In explaining a dietary practice of the Israelites, J reflects the existence of an organized state (Gen. 32:32). Twice in the Dinah episode Israel is alluded to as a nation with a national moral concern (Gen. 34:7, 31). In the previous chapter of this study attention was called to the pre-eminence of Judah in the Yahwistic account of the Joseph history (Gen. 37:26ff.; 43:3ff.; 44:14ff.; 46:28ff.). Judah is also in a favored position in Genesis 49:10 and Numbers 24:17-20.

These historical allusions to the Davidic monarchy show that J is reporting the Jacob tradition from the perspective of Jerusalem.[25] On the one hand J was guided by the traditions which already possessed a certain structure and fixation (whether oral or written), but on the other hand, J was permitted to narrate the traditions which were available from the perspective of the group which J represented. In accordance with these two presuppositions, J inserted both predictions of the rise of the Judean state and an awareness of the existence of Israel as a political monarchy in the narration of the Jacob tradition.

---

[25] The absence of Jerusalem in the Pentateuch is noteworthy because it confirms that the literary fixation of J made no considerable changes in the substance of the Pentateuch. Cf. Martin Noth, "Jerusalem and the Israelite tradition," The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies, trans. by D. R. Ap-Thomas, pp. 132-44. Cf. Artur Weiser, "Die Legitimation des Konigs David," VT, XVI:325-54, 1966; Walter Brueggemann, "David and His Theologi~~c~~an," CBQ, 30: 156-81, 1968.

David in the Blessing of Jacob

By recognizing the political situation of the Davidic state as the background to the work of J,[26] the significance of the emphasis on the blessing of Jacob can be illuminated by examining the connection between the promise to and blessing of Jacob with the theological purpose of J. Through a scheme of promise and fulfillment J has been able to achieve his desired intention of connecting the nomadic traditions of Israel with the contemporary development of the Davidic kingdom.[27] The obvious theme of the patriarchal narratives is promise, and the theme of promise in the patriarchal narratives is the basic theme of J.[28]

J introduces the patriarchal history with a threefold promise (Gen. 12:1-3), sustains this promise throughout the patriarchal narratives, and then concludes the stories of the patriarchs with a promise (Gen. 50:24). However, this scheme of promise and fulfillment must not be understood as a free creation of J; it is doubtless an elabora- of a theme of promise which was already present in older traditions of the tribes of Israel.[29]

---

[26] D. N. Freedman, "Pentateuch," IDB, Vol. K-Q, p. 714, noted that scholars are generally agreed that J has a southern orientation which is concerned with David as king and with his dynasty and that J is regarded as a product of the United Monarchy.

[27] Claus Westermann, Handbook to the Old Testament, trans. and ed. by Robert H. Boyd, p. 29.

[28] Clements, Abraham and David, p. 57. Cf. Walther Zimmerli, "Promise and Fulfillment," trans. by James Wharton, Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics, ed. by Claus Westermann, pp. 89-122.

Of all that J obtained from older patriarchal traditions, the theme of possession of the land doubtless was primary. This theme of the promised land which was already known by J was ~~the~~ an element in the patriarchal tradition and was decisive in the relationship between the patriarchs and the Exodus-Settlement traditions.[30] Not only is the promise of land an element of the most ancient of the traditions of which J is aware, but this promise of land is closely associated with Jacob and the house of Joseph.[31] Jacob is the original recipient of the promise of land (Deut. 26:6, 9; Josh. 24:13; cf. Deut. 6:23), and the integration of the promise to Jacob with the idea of Settlement was a provisional fulfillment of the promise of land in the time of Joshua.[32] Thus, the existence of the tribes of Joseph in the land of Canaan was a reminder to the house of Joseph that God had achieved what he had promised to Jacob.

---

[29] *Ibid*. Cf. von Rad, "Problem of the Hexateuch," pp. 54-63; Hans Walter Wolff, "The Kerygma of the Yahwist," trans. by Wilbur A. Benware, *Interpretation*, XX:137ff., 1966; Martin Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*, pp. 58-62.

[30] Wolff, *op. cit*., p. 140. Noth, *op. cit*., p. 59.

[31] Martin Noth, *The History of Israel*, 2nd ed., trans. by P. R. Ackroyd, p. 125 (hereafter, Noth, *History*).

J adopted this promise to Jacob from the traditions of the northern tribes and made it point forward to its effectual conclusion in the development and expansion of the Davidic state. Thus, J reached back to one of the oldest layers of Israelite tradition and revised it to apply to the possession of the land by the Davidic monarchy, establishing David's right to the land by a promise of God. J has collected the traditions of the patriarchs according to geographical points of view within the territory of David's Judean state and filled them with the nationalistic ideals of the Davidic state.[33]

The transfer of the older promise of land from Jacob to Abraham (Gen. 12:1-3; 15:7, 18; 28:13, etc.) is suitable for J's intention to foretell the rise of the Israelite empire under David.[34] That Yahweh purposed to bless all nations of the earth through Israel is verified by the fulfillment of the promise of increase and expansion of the Davidic state. Thus, the Covenant of David is shown to be the fulfillment of the Covenant of Abraham (II Sam. 23:5);[35] the "prophecy" to Abraham became the "blessing" of David. The source of the promise of land upon which the Covenant of Abraham was established stems from the fusion of the Jacob tradition with the southern traditions.[36]

---

[32] Von Rad, _op_. _cit_., p. 62.

[33] Gerhard Wallis, "Die Tradition von den drei Ahnvätern," ZAW, 81:18-40, 1969.

[34] In Gen. 15, the promise of land to Abraham is not attached to a sanctuary and could easily have been transferred to Abraham from a northern tradition of Jacob. Van Jan Dus, "Der Jakobbund Gen. 15:8ff.," ZAW, 80:35-38, 1968,

This fusion of the blessing of Jacob with the blessing of David can be detected in the so-called "Blessing of Jacob" (Gen. 49:1-28).[37] A good case can be made for the merger of what was once two recensions of these oracles (Jacob and Israel recensions). The blessing of the twelve

---

argued that Gen. 12:7a; 15:8ff.; 12:7b was originally told of Jacob and was localized at Shechem. The tradition was northern, but the location at Shechem is doubtful. Other instances of the transfer of themes from the Jacob tradition (Gen. 29:10ff.; 35:1ff.; 33:20) to Abraham (Gen. 12:10ff.; 12:6-8) confirm that J has attached an older northern tradition to the southern figure of Abraham. Cf. Artur Weiser, _The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development_, trans. by Dorothea M. Barton, pp. 109-10.

[35] G. E. Mendenhall, "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition," BA, XVII:72, 1954.

[36] Cf. Clements, _op. cit._, p. 34.

[37] Although the various oracles cannot be identified with any of Genesis' three major tradition strata, the final form of this chapter should be connected with J's literary activity in the time of David and Solomon. Some of the oracles of the tribes probably existed formerly in a detached form and only during a later period found their way into the present collection.

tribes is placed immediately after Jacob's blessing of Ephraim and Manasseh (Gen. 48) and immediately before the Exodus experience. That the two oracles about Judah and Joseph are clearly singled out from the others is evidence of the two major viewpoints which have been merged. The Israel recension contained oracles of the group of tribes which formed the Israel confederacy around Shechem and which called themselves "the sons of Israel." After Reuben's abortive attempt to rule, the tribe of Judah assumed the role of the chief tribe. David was later able to organize the house of Judah by uniting these western tribes with southern groups around Beersheba and Hebron, with Hebron becoming the rallying point for this house of Judah.[38]

The Jacob recension of Genesis 49 included oracles about the house of Joseph: Joseph is the only tribe among the twelve mentioned which receives a "blessing" from Jacob. The blessing of Joseph is the same type of blessing which was earlier observed in the life of Jacob, i.e., increase in land, fertility of land and womb, and guidance from God. This blessing of Joseph seems to reflect a period before Ephraim and Manasseh existed or a period when Ephraim had absorbed Manasseh within the house of Joseph; the latter is more probable and points to a time in the reign of Saul. Although Manasseh is mentioned in later literature, it has ceased to be a significant political force in the northern kingdom; nevertheless, Manassite traditions continued to live on in the north. The incorporation of the blessing of Joseph in a Judean work while Judah and Israel were rivals is improbable. Thus, the Joseph oracle was an independent composition of northern origin, and the Joseph oracle is the core around which the other oracles are gathered.[39]

---

[38] The older Song of Deborah (Judg. 5) does not mention Judah probably because Judah, Simeon, and Levi were included in the "sons of Israel," and the Song of Deborah was sung by the Joseph tribes.

The only feasible time for the Joseph oracle to have been incorporated into the Judean traditions is when the northern and southern tribes were united under David and Solomon. Indeed, the recognition of the Joseph oracle in Jerusalem would have had tremendous diplomatic value for the Davidic state in its attempt to woo the northern tribes to Jerusalem. The collection of these originally independent oracles around the Joseph oracle was likely the work of J.[40] To place the prediction of the pre-eminence of Judah in the mouth of Jacob was another diplomatic move of the Yahwist; Jacob predicts that the fraternal tribes will honor Judah, and the result is that the prophetic oracle is fulfilled through the rise of the Davidic monarchy. Consequently, the promise of blessing to Jacob which had its setting in the house of Joseph was utilized by J to pronounce blessing upon the person and rule of David.

---

[39] John Skinner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*, "The International Critical Commentary," 2nd ed., p. 508, commented on Gen. 49, "That it was composed from the first in the name of Jacob appears clearly from internal indications (vv. 3f., 9, [18], 26). . . ."

A similar combination of blessing and promise is found in the Oracles of Balaam (Num. 24:3-9; 15-19),[41] a passage in which the Jacob tradition also occurs. Behind the present form of the Balaam narratives must have existed a history of a renowned seer (Cf. Num. 31:8-16; Josh. 13:22; Gen. 36:32). Since Israel is represented by the inhabitants of southern East-Jordan, the original Balaam story was handed down in circles of Israelites who lived in this

---

[40] Cf. von Rad, Genesis, pp. 416-17; Sigmund Mowinckel, "Israelite Historiography," Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute, Vol. II, pp. 21-23.

[41] The Balaam saga (Num. 22-24) is not a homogeneous unit, but is composed of independent units of various origins. The Balaam Oracles (Num. 24:3-9; 15-19) were originally independent oracles which were incorporated into the Balaam saga by J during the United Monarchy. Cf. Weiser, op. cit., pp. 104-105; R. F. Johnson, "Balaam," IDB, Vol. A-D, pp. 341-42.

East-Jordan region.[42] A shrine of Baal Peor in East-Jordan was the context of the seer named Balaam.[43] Also, the prophecy of the ruler's deeds is localized in southern East-Jordan (Num. 24:17-19) and demarcates the restricted horizon of the Balaam Oracles which have been preserved by Israelites who lived there.[44] The geographical area of the Balaam Oracles is the same as the East-Jordan tradition of Jacob, and the original Balaam history could have been handed down by circles within the house of Joseph. Although this suggestion is pure speculation, the encounter of a tribe of Joseph with Moab could have involved alienated inhabitants of mixed origin (some even from Moab) with the king of Moab.[45] Thus, the whole Balaam story had its origin in the East-Jordan region and was preserved by the house of Joseph.

When J revised the Balaam Oracle (Num. 24:3-9;

---

[42] Martin Noth, Numbers: A Commentary, trans. by James D. Martin, pp. 172, 193.

[43] Cf. Georg Fohrer, Introduction to the Old Testament, trans. by David E. Green, pp. 131-32.

[44] Noth, op. cit., p. 193.

[45] The theory of G. E. Mendenhall explains the Balaam incident as the congregation of the indigenous population of the whole region of East-Jordan around a religious community who had received a special revelation from God. The King of Moab resorted to a curse because his own people were involved. Cf. Mendenhall, "The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine," BA, XXV:79-84, 1962.

15-19), the blessings which were pronounced over the house of Joseph ("Israel") by a seer named Balaam are applied to the Davidic kingship. First, J has applied the blessing which was given to Jacob (Gen. 27:29) and Abraham (Gen. 12:3) to the group which is likened unto a lion (Num. 24:9; cf. Gen. 49:9, where "Judah is a lion's whelp."). The prediction that Israel would have a king greater than Agag and that Israel's kingdom would be exalted refers to Saul's defeat of the Amalekites (I Sam. 15:8), and J may be alluding to the place of respect of the Davidic monarchy among the nations.[46] A note of unshaken national self-consciousness also is attested in the prediction that Israel would be ruled someday by a king who would subdue Moab and Edom. This prediction of Balaam (Num. 24:17ff.) was realized in the time of David (II Sam. 8:11-12).

J has made the real point of the Balaam saga to reside in the conviction that it is folly to oppose the providence of God; Israel's blessing was unpreventable.[47] Balak's desire for Israel to be cursed cannot be fulfilled because Yahweh's will was to bless Israel; therefore, the only word which Balaam could speak was a word of blessing upon Israel because Yahweh alone is the Lord of blessing.

---

[46] Cf. John Marsh, "The Book of Numbers: Introduction and Exegesis," IB, Vol. 2, p. 260.

[47] *Ibid*., p. 248.

Seen against the background of the developing glory of the Davidic kingdom, the Balaam Oracles contain the confirmation that Yahweh intended to continue the history of salvation through the medium of the Covenant of David which Yahweh had promised to his covenant people (II Sam. 7).

Unification of Tribes by Genealogy

In the present text of the biblical traditions Jacob is recognized as the third of the triumvirate of the fathers of Israel and as the father of the twelve tribes of Israel. Since the pre-Yahwistic version of the Jacob tradition was preserved by the house of Joseph among the northern tribes, the genealogical history of Jacob must have been constructed after the time of Saul. This genealogical connection of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob can be traced back to an attempt by J to show a genealogical relationship of the tribes of both the northern and southern kingdoms. By relating the tribes to a common father J is reflecting the attempt of the United Monarchy to unify the tribes under the king in Jerusalem. The unification of the tribes by the creation of a family history of Jacob is a part of J's plan to show Yahweh's election of the Davidic dynasty.

The acceptance of the previously independent traditions of the three patriarchs into the corpus of Jerusalem resulted in the establishment of a genealogical connection between Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.[48] Originally these three were unrelated to each other biologically and were tribal heroes of the groups who cherished and preserved these traditions.[49] Abraham was the patriarch for the area around Hebron; Isaac was connected with Beersheba and the Negeb; Jacob was associated with East-Jordan and possibly Bethel; and Israel was a patriarchal figure around Shechem.

Jacob was the tribal hero of the house of Joseph and also was recognized in the confederacy which was formed during Saul's kingship of the northern tribes (cf. II Sam. 2:9). Thus, one version of Israel's traditions (northern) remembered only Jacob as a patriarch (cf. Deut. 26:5; I Sam. 12:8). In its pre-Yahwistic stage, the Jacob tradition existed as cycles of traditions which were associated with East-Jordan holy places and which idealized a shepherd-figure which was called Jacob. In order for J to accept any part of the Jacob tradition, J had to accept all of the Jacob tradition. Consequently, J achieved a diplomatic victory when the transfer of the Ark and the election tradition of Jacob was accompanied by the focusing of Israel's eyes on the new center of religion in Jerusalem. At the same time, J found it necessary to assert the preeminence of the house of Judah.[50] The development of the traditions of the Davidic state afforded J an opportunity to give Abraham and Isaac (southern figures) genealogical precedence over Jacob.[51] Jacob became the son of Isaac,[52] and Isaac became the son of Abraham.

---

[48] Hermann Gunkel, The Legends of Genesis, trans. by W. H. Carruth, p. 98; Albrecht Alt, "The God of the Fathers," Essays on Old Testament History and Religion, trans. by R. A. Wilson, pp. 21, 47ff.

[49] Clements, Abraham and David, p. 31; Otto Eissfeldt, "Genesis," IDB, Vol. E-J, p. 379.

J's elevation of Abraham over Jacob was accomplished by fusing the Jacob tradition with the Abraham tradition. The promise of land to Jacob (Gen. 28:13) was transferred to Abraham and extended to encompass the Davidic monarchy (Gen. 12:3; cf. Psalm 105:8ff.). Abraham also was shown to have had a connection with Jerusalem that Jacob did not have (Gen. 14:18-24); Abraham was blessed by the God of Jerusalem, and Abraham is reported to have worshipped at Jerusalem. While Abraham was in Jerusalem, he received a theophany from Yahweh, thus emphasizing Abraham's pre-eminence at Jerusalem and authenticating the worship of Yahweh at this shrine (Gen. 15:4 J). A difference between the characterization of Abraham and Jacob also can be attributed to J's preference for Abraham. Abraham is a figure designed to be the pattern of the ideal Israelite, the man of faith and obedience, whom God can use as the instrument for the fulfillment of his purposes of restoration and blessing of his own people.[53] Jacob, on the other hand, is far more personal and individual; the cunning Jacob is continually sinning and suffering and is much more human than is Abraham.[54] J's rearrangement and reshaping of the Abraham tradition in order to give Abraham precedence over Jacob resulted in the Abraham tradition becoming a very fragmentary and disconnected narrative cycle.[55]

---

[50] Cf. ante.

[51] Cf. Noth, History, pp. 125-26.

[52] Alfred Jepsen, "Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Vätergestalten," Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität ("Gesellschafts-und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe"), 3:271, 1953-1954, attempted to show a connection between Isaac and the house of Joseph. Jepsen's argument rests on the close proximity of the sanctuary of Isaac at Beersheba to Egypt, the place where Joseph achieved honor. However, Jepsen falsely assumed that Jacob was preserved by Reuben and that Jacob was not preserved by the house of Joseph.

A corresponding transfer and revision of the Abraham tradition can be attested by comparing it with the Isaac tradition. Of the three versions of the theme of the

---

[53] S. H. Hooke, "Genesis," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley, p. 187.

[54] *Ibid*., pp. 194-95.

[55] Claus Westermann, *Handbook to the Old Testament*, trans. by Robert H. Boyd, p. 40, noted that Gen. 12-25 are essentially single narratives which are held together quite loosely by the basic theme of the promise of a son or of land. In the Jacob tradition the promise is an integral part of the tradition and is not a theological thematic link to unite the Jacob cycle.

"jeopardy of the ancestress" (Gen. 12:10-20 [J] ; 20:1-18 [E] ; and 26:7-11 [J]) the Isaac version is the oldest.[56]

J's freedom to rearrange, shape, and reinterpret the Abraham tradition in light of the theme of salvation history afforded an opportunity to establish Abraham as the father of Isaac, who was the father of Jacob. By constructing a family history with Abraham as the head, J could extend the promise of land associated with Jacob to include the descendants of Abraham. By a continued renewal of the promise to Abraham's descendants, the promise of the land was made to point forward to an interim fulfillment in the Settlement under Joshua; at the same time the promise would find its effectual fruition in the emergence of the Israelite state under David.[57]

---

[56] Julius Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel, trans. by J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies, p. 320, argued convincingly that the Abraham stories have utilized the Isaac stories. The Isaac tradition is short, terse, and profane; the Isaac hero is more lively and pointed. Wellhausen remarked that the only reason commentators have regarded Gen. 20 as the original of Gen. 26 is that Abraham was considered to be older because he was the father of Isaac. In contrast, the Abraham tradition shows a tendency to make Abraham the patriarch par excellence. Von Rad, Genesis, pp. 264-66, supported the antiquity of Isaac. Cf. Martin Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch, pp. 114-18, 170f., 208f. Klaus Koch, The Growth of the Biblical Tradition: The Form-Critical Method, trans. from the 2nd German ed. by S. M. Cupitt, pp. 111-32, came to the following conclusion concerning the three versions of the theme of the "jeopardy of the ancestress": "Accordingly Isaac was originally the subject; he was replaced by Abraham, who for the Israelites represented their ideal of the god-fearing Israelite" (p. 126).

At what precise date this arrangement of the patriarchs in a chronological order was accomplished by J is unclear. The three independent traditions of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob could have been accepted into the Jerusalem corpus of traditions and could have been constructed into a family unit at a later time. J's collection of the patriarchal traditions was not done by one hand or all at one period, but was carried out in the course of a very long process by a school of redactors who viewed the traditions from a Jerusalem perspective against the background of the Davidic monarchy.[58] The diplomatic desire of the Davidic monarchy led to the acceptance of the Jacob tradition by Jerusalem, but the offensiveness of the dynamic and religious character of the Jacob tradition caused J to place Abraham and Isaac ahead of Jacob by constructing a family history with Abraham as the head.

Another method of showing the unity of the tribes of Israel was the emphasis of the twelve tribes as a family with Jacob as their common father. An investigation of the nature of the confederacy of the twelve tribes, as well as the identity of the names of the individual tribes which are listed in differing orders, goes beyond the scope of this study.[59] What is of interest here is the recognition of Jacob as the father of the tribes of Israel. Assuming that the Blessing of Jacob (Gen. 49:1-28) was compiled against the background of the Davidic monarchy, the unifying effect of the conception of the tribes of Israel as a family with Jacob as their father should be observed in the Blessing of Jacob.

---

[57] Clements, _Abraham and David_, pp. 57-60.

[58] Cf. Gunkel, _op. cit._, pp. 124ff.

In ancient Israel the most basic expression of community and kinship which could be found was a family which was focused in one individual, the father. The father was the beginning point of the family, and the sons were those who claimed community of kin with this ancestral figure.[60] As creator, head, master, and source of life and blessing, the father represented the family in legal and sacral matters (Judg. 17:10; 18:19).[61] The corporate personality of the family and the clan was centered in the person of the father of the group. Thus, Israel could express a profound sense of community and kinship by referring to itself as a family with a common father. The unity of Israel which the symbol of the family implied depended upon a kinship of soul which arose out of a common character and a common history, and this unity was expressed in Israel by tracing the origin of the tribes to a common ancestor, Jacob.[62] The bond which united Israel as a community was the view that all the members of the family of Israel had one father; in the thought of Israel, the sons or members of the family shared a common obligation and responsibility to the ultimate source of their life and history.[63]

---

[59] On these problems cf. the recent work by Hans-Jürgen Zobel, *Stammesspruch und Geschichte*, which contains a full bibliography.

[60] Johannes Pedersen, *Israel: Its Life and Culture*, trans. by Aslaug Møller, Vol. I-II, p. 48.

[61] Gottlob Schrenk, "*πατήρ*," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. by Gerhard Friedrich, trans. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Vol. V, pp. 962-63.

That the Jacob figure was father of a number of sons is so firmly rooted in the Jacob tradition that the pre-Yahwistic version of the Jacob tradition must have told of Jacob as the father of a large number of sons. The names of Jacob's sons cannot be recovered with any certainty from the various lists of the tribes. One of the oldest poems in the Old Testament, The Song of Deborah (Judg. 5), contains evidence of the fact that the names of some of Jacob's sons denoted territories instead of individuals, e.g., Gad is designated by the region of Gilead where the tribe resided (Judg. 5:17; cf. Judg. 6:35).[64] The Song of Deborah does not even mention Judah, Simeon, and Levi when the various tribes of central and northern Palestine are described. If the early collections of oracles about the individual tribes were brief aphorisms which were circulated independently among the various tribes in the pre-monarchical era (cf. Gen. 49; Num. 24; Judg. 5, etc.), the existence of a twelve-tribe confederacy which was derived from the names of the sons of Jacob is unlikely (cf. II Sam. 2:8-9). The genealogical association of Jacob to the twelve tribes of Israel which had derived from the twelve sons of Jacob who had the same names as the tribes of Israel had must be judged just as unhistorical as the genealogical order of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.[65]

---

[62] Pedersen, op. cit., p. 57.

[63] James Muilenburg, The Way of Israel: Biblical Faith and Ethics, "Religious Perspectives Series," p. 39.

Therefore, the Jacob tradition which was transferred from the northern kingdom to the monarchical center of worship in Jerusalem recalled Jacob as a tribal hero who had been blessed with a large number of sons; the number of sons may, or may not, have been twelve, but that their names were the same as the names of the later tribes of

---

[64] Pedersen, op. cit., p. 32.

[65] Otto Eissfeldt, "Genesis," IDB, Vol. E-J, p. 379; Noth, History, pp. 54-55; von Rad, Genesis, pp. 416ff.

Israel is unlikely. The conclusion of the Blessing of Jacob (Gen. 49:28a) reflects the collector's awareness that the "blessings" concerned the tribes of Israel and not Jacob's sons; this verse is further evidence that J established Jacob as the father of the twelve tribes of Israel.[66]

For the Judean officials to recognize Jacob as the father of a tribal family of which Judah was a member would have had a tremendous effect on the attempt to unify the kingdom. At the same time, Judah's acknowledgment of Jacob as their ancestor established the inheritance rights of the Davidic monarchy to the land promised to Jacob's descendants; the house of David thereby would become a legitimate heir to the inheritance of Judah's father, Jacob. Therefore, J is presented with an excellent motive to arrange the tribes of the United Monarchy into a family with Jacob as their father. The extension of the boundaries of the Davidic kingdom would be interpreted by J as the fulfillment of Yahweh's promise to Jacob and his descendants.

Summary

That the Jacob tradition was accepted into the body of Judean traditions against the background of the reigns of David and Solomon is a safe conclusion. The connection of the promise and blessing in the Jacob tradition with the election of the Davidic monarchy can be attributed to the desire of the J tradition circle to show Yahweh's choice of David and his capital in Jerusalem. The J version of the Jacob tradition alludes to predictions of the preeminence of the house of Judah, and, by means of a scheme of promise and fulfillment, J is able to show a connection between the nomadic tradition of Jacob and the contemporary developments in the Davidic kingdom. The promise of land which was so integral to the Jacob tradition is extended to the house of Judah and is fulfilled by the expansion of the territory of the kingdom of David and Solomon. Although J was not at liberty to alter traditions which already existed, J was allowed to rearrange the traditions and provide editorial introductions, transitions, and conclusions to the individual traditions; therefore, J placed Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in their present genealogical arrangement in order to establish a southern patriarch's precedence over a northern patriarch, Jacob. Finally, the recognition of Jacob as the father of the twelve tribes of Israel is J's attempt to unify the Davidic kingdom and to show Judah's right to the inheritance of the land which was promised to Jacob.

---

[66] Eugene H. Maly, "Genesis," *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*, ed. by Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy, p. 48.

B. THE JACOB TRADITION IN JUDAH DURING THE DIVIDED MONARCHY

The sources for a study of the Jacob tradition in Judah from the division of the United Kingdom (ca. 922 B.C.) until the appearance of Isaiah of Jerusalem (742 B.C.) are no longer detectable in the biblical materials. Editorial changes were doubtless made in the Yahwistic version of the Jacob tradition for a long time after the reign of Solomon, but none of these changes can be related to Judah during the period of the Divided Monarchy with any certainty. For the period from 742 B.C. until the Exile in 587 B.C., the sources for the study of the Jacob tradition in Judah will include the prophecies of Isaiah of Jerusalem and Micah.

Isaiah of Jerusalem and Jacob

As a native of Jerusalem, Isaiah had access to the rich store of traditions about the election of the Davidic dynasty and Jerusalem.[67] Isaiah's understanding of God's promise to his people was linked with the traditional faith of his city and shows no significant interest in the Sinai covenant.[68] The ancient covenant of God with Israel took second place in Jerusalem to the promises which God made to the house of David and to the seat of David's rule in Jerusalem. The temple in Jerusalem was singled out as the place where all nations should come to worship God. In this temple Isaiah himself experienced a decisive encounter with God, and here in the temple Isaiah was called to be a prophet of the faith and justice of Yahweh.[69]

---

[67] Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology, trans. by D. M. G. Stalker, Vol. II, p. 156 (hereafter, von Rad, Theology).

The God of Jacob

The Jacob tradition is introduced in the prophecies of Isaiah in an oracle which exalts Zion as the center of worship for all nations (Isa. 2:2-4; cf. Mic. 4:1-3).[70] This oracle refers to the temple on mount Zion as the domain of the "God of Jacob" (Isa. 2:3). This epithet for Yahweh is used almost exclusively in passages which present the Jerusalemite theology (I Sam. 23:1; Psalm 20:1; 46:7, 11; 75:9; 76:6; 81:1, 4; 84:8; 94:7; 114:7; 146:5). The

---

[68] R. E. Clements, The Conscience of the Nation, "Approaching the Bible," p. 91 (hereafter, Clements, Conscience).

[69] Walther Zimmerli, The Law and the Prophets, trans. by R. E. Clements, pp. 73, 75.

[70] John Gray, "The Kingship of God in the Prophets and Psalms," VT, XI:14-15, 1961, has suggested that this oracle is not original with either Isa. or Mic. ". . . it may well stem from a liturgical source on which both prophets felt at liberty to draw" (p. 15).

Lord of Zion is not designated in this oracle as the "Great King" (Psalm 48:2; 95:3), nor as "El Elyon" (Gen. 14:18-22; Psalm 46:4; 78: 17, 35, 36, etc.), as the God of Jerusalem was called formerly; these epithets were of Canaanite origin and could be misunderstood in a new context.[71] Thus, the ancient motifs which were associated with the election of Zion (e.g., the mountain of God) were reshaped into an oracle which appealed for the election of Zion on the basis of a tradition which connected the God of Jacob with the election of Zion.[72]

Evidently, the security of the throne of Judah had been threatened, and Isaiah proclaimed that the throne could be secured only by faith in God and not by negotiating secret agreements with foreign powers.[73] The prophet Isaiah is sounding a warning to those who were more interested in the divine sanction of the Davidic dynasty in Jerusalem than in the covenantal obligation of the kingdom of Judah to Yahweh. The sacral traditions which were preserved in the Hymns of Zion had left the impression that

---

[71] Hans. Wildberger, Jesaja, X/2, "Biblischer Kommentar altes Testament," p. 85.

[72] Cf. R. E. Clements, Prophecy and Covenant, "Studies in Biblical Theology," No. 43, pp. 45-68 (hereafter, Clements, Prophecy); Gerhard von Rad, "The City on the Hill," The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, trans. by E. W. Trueman Dicken, pp. 232-42.

[73] Clements, Conscience, p. 93.

Jerusalem was a holy mountain and could not be destroyed. The oracle which is used by Isaiah and Micah envisions the security of the throne of Judah as resting upon an encounter with the covenant God of Israel. The Israelites were not to come to the temple to acknowledge the deity of the mountain, as was true in the Jebusite city; rather, they were encouraged to put their faith in Yahweh, the God of Jacob, as their refuge and protection (Psalm 46:1, 7, 11; 48:1).[74] That a faith-encounter with the God of Zion could occur at the temple was verified in the call-experience of Isaiah (chap. 6).

A threat to the welfare of the Davidic dynasty developed during the Syro-Ephraimitic crisis when Israel and Syria united in a war against Ahaz. Disaster to Judah was averted by Ahaz's appeal to Tiglath-pileser III of Assyria. Ahaz immediately became subservient to Assyria and finally was driven to strip the temple of its valuable bronze in order to satisfy the growing demands of Assyria for tribute (II Kgs. 16:17-18). An appeal for the God of Jacob to stabilize his throne in Judah is suitable for the context of the Syro-Ephraimitic crisis.

---

[74] Wildberger, *loc. cit.* Cf. Georg Fohrer, *Das Buch Jesaja*, "Zürcher Bibelkommentare," Vol. I, p. 53.

The House of Jacob

A very striking use of the Jacob tradition proves to be very popular with Isaiah of Jerusalem. The term "house of Jacob" appears six times in Isaiah 1-39 of a total of twenty-one times in the entire Old Testament (Isa. 2:5, 6; 8:17; 10:20; 14:1; 29:22). This phrase occurs only three times outside the prophetic literature (Gen. 46:27; Ex. 19:3; Psalm 114:1), but is present in the body of tradition used by Amos, Micah, Jeremiah, Exilic Isaiah, and Obadiah.

The house of Jacob was a community of kinsmen with a common ancestor, the bearer of the unity. "Wherever those of one mind form a community round a common leader, they are a house. . . ."[75] The strong bond of kinship which united the house of Jacob was something the sons of Jacob experienced together. "Israel hat als 'Haus Jakobs' beim Anszug aus Ägypten Jahwer wunderbare Hilfe erfahren."[76] By referring to the house of Jacob Isaiah reminded the people of the salvation experience which the sons of Jacob shared in the Exodus. This interpretation is supported by all three of the extra-prophetical uses of the "house of Jacob" (Gen. 46:27; Ex. 19:3; Psalm 114:1), which clearly assume the house of Jacob to be those who were bound together by sharing the experience of the Exodus.

---

[75] Johannes Pedersen, _Israel_: _Its_ _Life_ _and_ _Culture_, Vol. I-II, p. 54.

[76] Wildberger, _op_. _cit_., p. 87.

Yet a basic ambiguity arises when an attempt is made to historicize the house of Jacob in the prophetic materials of Isaiah, or of the other prophets for that matter. G. B. Gray seriously struggled with whether the house of Jacob referred to the northern kingdom or the southern kingdom, or to both together, but Gray allowed the uncertainty to remain.[77] If the book of Isaiah was composed and redacted over a long period of time as was the Pentateuch,[78] the house of Jacob referred to different cult-communities in different historical contexts. Prior to David the house of Jacob would have denoted the northern tribes of the house of Joseph; during David and Solomon's reigns the house of Jacob would have signified all of those from Israel and

---

[77] George Buchanan Gray, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah I-XXXIX, "The International Critical Commentary," pp. 51-52.

[78] J. H. Eaton, "The Origin of the Book of Isaiah," VT, IX:138-57, 1959, viewed the book of Isaiah as composed of three strata: the first stratum contained the traditions of Isaiah himself; the second stratum consisted of material which the disciples of Isaiah inherited (chaps. 13-27); the third stratum was developed in the context of the Exile (chaps. 34-35; 40-66). The author of this dissertation accepts a stratified composition of Isaiah, but does not agree with Eaton's division of the strata, especially in regard to the third stratum. A fourth stratum is needed to account for the reworking of the material of Isaiah of the Exile; this fourth stratum is particularly apparent in Isaiah 56-66, which was formerly called Trito-Isaiah.

Judah who accepted the traditions of the Exodus as a part of their own religious heritage. If the election traditions of the Exodus and Sinai became secondary to the divine authorization of the Davidic state in Judah during the Divided Monarchy,[79] the concept of the house of Jacob would have been more at home in the northern kingdom. When the threat of domination by the Syro-Ephraimitic alliance, or by Assyria, endangered the election of the Judean capital, Isaiah of Jerusalem announced the terms of Yahweh's future protection of Judah.

Although Isaiah spoke very little about the Exodus or Sinai, he did expose the political alliances, the superstitions, the pride, and disobedience of the people for what they really were, i.e., a lack of "faith" in the God who had saved Israel in the past. Judgment would come, but beyond the darkness stood a promise of the God who had been faithful to his plan and work.[80] A king out of the genuine election tradition of the house of Jacob would bring stability and honor to the throne of David (Isa. 9:7). Thus, in contrast to the emphasis given to the political aspect of the election of Zion, the allusion to the house of Jacob stressed the religious dimension of the election of Jerusalem and the throne of David.

---

[79] Clements, Prophecy, pp. 45-65.

[80] Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 75.

Other References to Jacob

In two oracles which inveigh doom upon the northern kingdom "Jacob" is identified with the northern kingdom of Israel (Isa. 9:8; 17:4). In both passages Jacob is connected with a proud and arrogant attitude which would bring forth punishment on Jacob in the day of judgment. The reason for the use of Jacob to allude to the northern kingdom is explainable on the basis of the literary form of the prophecy. Both Isaiah 9:8-12 and 17:1-11 are classified as Judgment-Speeches against a nation (JN).[81] These speeches are completely literary formulations and first began to be passed down in a special tradition which was independent of the accounts which were addressed to their audiences. The character of the prophetic announcement of judgment deviated significantly from the event to which it originally belonged, and became a new and freer formation while in its detached state.[82] The basic structure of the prophetic Judgment-Speech permitted the assimilation of various traditions or the altering of the speech to meet new situations.[83]

---

[81] Claus Westermann, Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech, trans. by Hugh Clayton White, pp. 171, 177.

[82] Ibid., p. 172.

Thus, the appearance of Jacob in these Judgment-Speeches (Isa. 9:9; 17:4) against Israel likely had a previous history in the prophetic circles of the northern kingdom. Isaiah has drawn upon this Judgment-Speech against the northern kingdom to show Judah what can happen to the southern kingdom.

Jacob and Micah

Isaiah's contemporary, Micah, held a view of the election of Zion and the Davidic dynasty which was quite similar to Isaiah's. Micah also used the concept of the "house of Jacob" (Mic. 2:7; 3:1, 9) and the oracle of the glorious future of Zion (Mic. 4:1-4) as did Isaiah.

Heads of Jacob

Nothing was more sacred to Micah than justice and equity, yet the very people who were responsible for the maintenance of justice in Judah were in deliberate pursuit of evil.[84] Micah designates these leaders of Jerusalem as "heads of Jacob" (Mic. 3:1, 9). These heads of Jacob were leaders of the community which claimed kinship with the election tradition of the older tribes of Israel. In this regard, the heads of Jacob is a phrase that differs very little with the house of Jacob (cf. Isa. 1:10).

---

[83] *Ibid*., p. 173.

[84] E. W. Heaton, *The Hebrew Kingdoms*, "The New Clarendon Bible," p. 312.

Since both occurrences of the heads of Jacob can be identified as parts of a Judgment-Speech against a nation (Mic. 3:1-2, 4 and 3:9-12),[85] the concept of the heads of Jacob could have had a prior history in the northern kingdom; in the northern kingdom the heads of Jacob would have represented the heirs of the Exodus, Sinai, and Settlement traditions. The incorporation of this oracle of judgment by Micah was probably preceded by the fall of the northern kingdom, so that Judah had become the locus of the sole representatives of Israel.[86]

The Transgression of Jacob

A prophecy of judgment against Samaria and Jerusalem (Mic. 1:2-9) concludes that the destruction of the northern kingdom is a direct consequence of the sin of the leaders in Samaria (v. 5). The apostasy of the leaders is described as the "transgression of Jacob," and Jacob is used with Samaria as a parallel to Judah and Jerusalem. For Samaria to have transgressed presupposes that Samaria had a covenant relationship with God prior to the apostasy of Israel; the northern kingdom had disregarded their covenant obligation to Yahweh and thereby had nullified Yahweh's promise to deliver and redeem the northern kingdom.

---

[85] Westermann, op. cit., pp. 174-75.

[86] Cf. Theodore H. Robinson, Die Zwölf kleinen Propheten: Hosea bis Micha, 3rd ed., "Handbuch zum Alten Testament," Vol. 14, p. 137; Frederick Carl Eiselen, The Minor Prophets, p. 393.

This threat of punishment for the transgression should be understood against the background of an autumn festival at Jerusalem at which time the old Hebrew historical and covenantal traditions were dramatically represented.[87] By alluding to the amphictyonic law, Micah was trying to incorporate a purer election tradition for Zion and was reacting to the election tradition which was contained in the royal liturgies of the Davidic dynasty.[88] The prophets who drifted south after the fall of the northern kingdom gained enough of a following to lead in a polemic against the election of David in favor of older traditions which were cherished in the northern kingdom. Micah's attack upon the inviolability of Zion likely was influenced by these displaced northern prophets.

---

[87] Walter Beyerlin, Die Kulttraditionen Israels in der Verkündigung des Propheten Micha, "Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments," No. 72, pp. 35, 84.

[88] Cf. N. W. Porteous, "The Prophets and the Problem of Continuity," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, ed. by B. W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson, pp. 20-21.

If the northern kingdom had already fallen when Micah announced this verdict of judgment upon Judah, the transgression of Jacob would have been paid for previously; therefore, a revival of the election tradition of Jacob would be a valid hope for those northern leaders who escaped to Judah. Although the connection of Jacob with David would have been preserved by the Yahwistic circles and consequently would have been present in Jerusalem before the fall of Samaria, the revival of interest in Jacob in the Davidic capital can be related to the attempt of the Deuteronomists who made use of northern traditions to reform and reinterpret the cult tradition of Jerusalem. Prophets and priests from the north exerted their influence in the revival and reformation of Judah by collecting and composing the Book of Deuteronomy.[89] Jacob was evidently closely connected with the deuteronomic theology which guided the attempt to reform Judah.

Interest in an ethical basis of a covenant which the transgression of Jacob and the sin of Israel presuppose is closely connected with the reform movement of which the Book of Deuteronomy was born.[90] That the cultic tradition in Judah which was associated with the king was capable of preserving the memory of Israel's moral code is granted, but in actual practice the moral responsibilities of the kingship were secondary to the legitimization of the Davidic dynasty. Micah envisioned the complete destruction of Jerusalem (Mic. 1:5; 3:12) and looked for the "assembly of Yahweh" to restore the patriarchal arrangements for land tenure.[91] A careful study is needed on the relationship of Micah to the deuteronomic theology.

---

[89] Cf. R. E. Clements, "Deuteronomy and the Jerusalem Cult Tradition," VT, XV:300-12, 1965; E. W. Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition, pp. 83ff.

Summary

After the United Kingdom divided into northern and southern kingdoms, the Jacob tradition was preserved in Jerusalem in connection with the traditions of the election of Zion and David; however, the Jacob tradition became secondary to the political aspects of the election of Zion and David. The threat to the throne of Judah and the danger of invasion of the land prompted Isaiah and Micah to take another look at the election of Zion. When Israel fell, those prophets who drifted south likely had an influence on the opposition to the election of Zion which began to germinate. Whether the prophecies in which the Jacob tradition was contained had an earlier history in the north is difficult to determine, but the revival of interest in Jacob tradition is clearly associated with the threat to the election of Zion and the Davidic king.

---

[90] Clements, Prophecy, pp. 69-85, esp. 77ff.; N. W. Porteous, "The Basis of the Ethical Teaching of the Prophets," Studies in Old Testament Prophecy, ed. by H. H. Rowley, pp. 143-56. Cf. A. R. Johnson, Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel, 2nd ed., pp. 136ff.

[91] Von Rad, Theology, Vol. II, p. 150.

C. THE REINTERPRETATION OF JACOB AFTER 587 B.C.

The fall of Jerusalem in 587 B.C. had a profound influence on the election traditions of Judah. When the Davidic lineage was severed during the Exile, the cultic officials were left with the problem of explaining the "everlasting covenant" which God had made with David and which had been interpreted to mean that a Davidic king would always be on the throne in Jerusalem. Also, the Exile raised the problem of the loss of the land which had been promised to their forefathers and to their descendants. Since both of these problems were connected with the Jacob tradition in older traditions of the Hebrews, a reinterpretation of the Jacob tradition would be expected after the fall of Jerusalem.

A history of the Jacob tradition in the post-Exilic writings is both difficult and precarious because of the extremely complex state of the present text of the literature of this period. The primary sources for this section of the study are found in the prophecies of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah 40-66, and Malachi, in some of the psalms, and in the Priestly version of the Pentateuch. Space will permit only a cursory treatment of individual texts; further studies of the use of the patriarchal traditions in the individual prophets and psalms should be pursued.

Jeremiah and the Jacob Tradition

Although the majority of Jeremiah's ministry took place before the Exile, the prophecies of Jeremiah which contain the Jacob tradition cannot be dated in the pre-Exilic period with confidence. Among those prophecies which can be associated with the reign of Josiah (640-609 B.C.), the expression, "the house of Jacob"(Jer. 2:4; 5:20), is used to refer to the representatives of the covenant tradition of old Israel; this usage is not unlike that of Isaiah of Jerusalem and Micah.

Sympathy for Jacob

Whereas Isaiah and Micah used the Jacob tradition with no apparent attraction for the Jacob figure, the prophecies of Jeremiah show a certain sympathy for Jacob. The Book of Consolation (Jer. 30-31), which contains material from the period of Josiah to long after the death of Jeremiah, presents the Jacob figure in a very favorable light (Jer. 30:7, 10, 18; 31:7, 11).[92] Every reference to Jacob in the Book of Consolation describes him as being in great distress, but in each case Jacob is expected to be delivered from his distress. The introduction to this pericope clearly assumes that both Israel and Judah are in Exile (Jer. 30:3), and the Davidic king is no longer on the throne (30:9). Thus, the introduction, regardless of its date, connects the deliverance of Jacob with the age-old promise of land to the patriarch Jacob (30:3). When the Israelites were expelled from the promised land, some of the prophets (the disciples of Jeremiah?) returned to the ancient traditions for a message of hope; the promise of land to Jacob was reinterpeted in the context of the Exile to mean that those who identified themselves with the sons of Jacob could look forward to a repossession of the land which God had promised to the sons ("descendants") of Jacob.

A reference to the "portion of Jacob" (RSV) is included in a hymn which praises Yahweh as cosmic king

---

[92] Scholars are in sharp debate about the date of Jer. 30-31. Wilhelm Rudolph, Jeremia, "Handbuch zum Alten Testament," Vol. 12, pp. 172-73, accepted chapters 30-31 as the words of Jeremiah which were addressed to northern Israel during Josiah's reign. John Bright, Jeremiah, "The Anchor Bible," pp. 284-85, attributed some of the material to the early ministry of Jeremiah, other words to a later period in his life, and an expansion of these sayings to the disciples of Jeremiah. Bright's position is more nearly a reflection of the history of tradition.

(Jer. 10:12-16). Yahweh is acclaimed sovereign over the earth, the heavens, the waters, the mist, rain, wind, and idols. The portion of Jacob is not like the idols because Yahweh has achieved victory over the cosmos and because Israel is the tribe of Yahweh's inheritance (v. 16). What the portion of Jacob refers to is not clear; most commentators interpret the word חֵלֶק as the "possession, portion," i.e., the people of Yahweh (cf. Deut. 32:9). The word חֵלֶק can also mean a "tract" of land or "territory";[93] the divisions of land which were distributed at the Conquest are referred to as חֵלֶק (Josh. 19:9; Deut. 10:9, etc.; cf. Hos. 5:7; Mic. 2:4; Isa. 61:7; Ezek 48:8). The "portion" of Jacob is either the "people" of Jacob or the "territory" of Jacob. The portion of Jacob is not like idols which perish, but the portion of Jacob will endure because Yahweh reigns over all things and has chosen Israel as the one who will inherit the blessing. Jeremiah 10:12-16 is quoted again in 51:15-19, which indicates that this pericope had an independent existence before it was inserted into the prophecies of Jeremiah.

Jacob and David

The descendants of Jacob are connected with David in a passage whose theme is the fulfillment of the promise which God made to the house of Israel and the house of Judah (Jer. 33:14-26, esp. vv. 14, 26).[94] The people had complained that Yahweh had rejected the two families which he had chosen and that the nation no longer existed (v. 24). Yahweh responds that the promise to the patriarchs and to David will be granted just as surely as night follows day. The restoration of the fortunes of the descendants of Jacob, which are the descendants of David, is implied to be the fulfilling of that promise. The restoration of their fortunes clearly refers to the return of the exiled people to the promised land. This prophecy hints that the promise of an everlasting covenant with David can be maintained by a return of the people to Zion and to the promised land.[95]

---

[93] BDB, p. 324.

Although most of the passages in which the Jacob tradition appears in the prophecies of Jeremiah can be dated after the lifetime of Jeremiah, the heritage of Jeremiah was connected with Jacob. Jeremiah was from a priestly family at Anathoth of the tribe of Benjamin, and some near relatives of Jeremiah owned land there (Jer. 32:6ff.). Since Jeremiah's ancestress was Rachel, the mother of

---

[94] Because this whole section is lacking in the LXX, Rudolph, op. cit., pp. 199-201, has suggested that this passage is an independent composition, designed to promise the continuance of the Davidic kingship and the Levitic priesthood.

[95] Cf. M. Sekine, "Davidsbund und Sinaibund bei Jeremia," VT, 9:47-57, 1959.

Benjamin and the wife of Jacob (Jer. 31:15), the traditions with which Jeremiah would have been most familiar would have been those which were cherished in Benjamin and Ephraim, i.e., those of the Exodus, Sinai, and Settlement.[96] The close connection of Hosea's thought and phraseology with the prophecies of Jeremiah indicates that Jeremiah was a disciple of this northern prophet. Jeremiah had access to the ancient covenantal traditions in the prophecies of Hosea. "Jeremiah was Hosea's spiritual successor."[97]

Only after Jeremiah had received his call in Jerusalem did he encounter the sacral traditions of David and the election of Zion. Jeremiah would not have met the Davidic covenant tradition in the north; thus, the use of both the northern and southern election traditions by Jeremiah would be possible and probable.[98] Therefore, the appearance of the Jacob tradition among the prophecies of Jeremiah may be attributed to the interest of Jeremiah in northern traditions. After the Exile, these prophecies (some oral?) were expanded by Jeremiah's disciples to fit the changed historical situation of a displaced people who thought their God had forsaken them. That both the Davidic covenant (Jer. 23:5f.; cf. 22:30 and 33:14ff.) and the tradition of Israel's election in the Exodus, Sinai, and Settlement are utilized in the prophecies of Jeremiah shows how Jeremiah was guided by the traditions which he inherited.

---

[96] Von Rad, Theology, Vol. II, p. 192.

[97] N. W. Porteous, "The Prophets and the Problem of Continuity," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, ed. by B. W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson, p. 18.

[98] Cf. Clements, Prophecy, pp. 51ff.

Jacob and Ezekiel

Ezekiel, like Jeremiah, displays a familiarity with both the Exodus-Sinai-Settlement traditions (Ezek. 20:1-44) and the Zion traditions (Ezek. 17:22-24; 21:32; 34:23-24; 37:15-28).[99] Ezekiel also knows the earlier literary prophets and their work and up-dates their message for his own day.[100]

The Jacob tradition occurs only four times in the prophecies of Ezekiel (Ezek. 20:5; 28:25; 37:25; 39:25), but all four references to Jacob are directly connected with the promise of land. The election of the descendants of Jacob in Egypt (20:5) is verified by Settlement in the land of promise (20:6).[101] The Exile in 587 B.C. is implied to be the result of an apostasy which began in Egypt. To be returned to the land of Palestine would be a fulfillment of the promise of land to Jacob and his descendants. In contrast to chapter 16, which limits the election of Israel to Jerusalem and Judah, "the descendants of Jacob " (20:5) include both northern Israel and Judah. The election of Israel rests squarely upon Yahweh's choice of the descendants of Jacob in the Exodus experience; David is noticeably absent from this account of the election of Israel.[102] Thus, the election tradition associated with Jacob has been substituted for the election traditions of David. The obvious explanation of the reinterpretation of the election of Israel is that the Davidic kingship had been obliterated and the land of promise had been dispossessed.

---

[99] Ezek. reveals a lively history of tradition, editing, and additions to the prophet's words as the book was collected and transmitted within the framework of a circle of disciples. Cf. Walter Zimmerli, "The Message of the Prophet Ezekiel," Interpretation, XXIII:131-57, 1969.

[100] *Ibid*., pp. 136ff.

The future security of Israel is stressed in an Oracle of Salvation (Heilsorakel) in which Yahweh declared that he would manifest his holiness among the nations by restoring his people to the land which he had promised to Jacob and his descendants (Ezek. 28:25-26).[103]

---

[101] Ibid., p. 144, "In 20:1-31, the school's later work expanded the text, especially with verses 27-29."

[102] Von Rad, Theology, Vol. II, p. 236, maintained that Ezek. strangely was unable to expound the David tradition. "One looks in vain in Ezekiel for an exposition of the subjects connected with it: instead, in both passages [Ezek. 34:23-25; 37:25ff.] he glides into the wording of the Exodus-covenant tradition."

Ezekiel has effected a fusion of the election traditions of Jacob and David in an oracle which calls for the restoration of the United Kingdom (Ezek. 37:25). A shepherd whom God will set over his people (cf. Ezek. 34:23-24) is the servant David who is to rule over Judah and Joseph who will be reunited as one nation. Under the rule of this ideal king Israel will live in obedience and faithfulness (36:24) and will occupy the land which was promised to Jacob (37:25) and his descendants, who were the forefathers of the audience of this prophecy.

The restoration of the fortunes (lit. "captivity") of Jacob will vindicate the integrity of the Lord's holiness (Ezek. 39:25).[104] The reversal of the present fortunes of Jacob (Exile) will mean that the whole house of Israel (Israel and Judah) will dwell securely in their land (39:26). Thus, to be delivered from the Exile is a renewal of the covenant which God had made with the sons of

---

[103] James Muilenburg, "Ezekiel," _Peake's Commentary on the Bible_, ed. by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley, pp. 582-83.

[104] Ezek. 39:21-29 has no vital connection with the preceding passage on Gog and dates after the Exile. Arnold J. Tkacik, "Ezekiel," _The Jerome Biblical Commentary_, ed. by Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy, p. 362.

Jacob.[105] This new Exodus theology shows great affinity with the thought of Isaiah 40-66.

Exilic Isaiah[106] and Jacob

The message of Exilic Isaiah is directly related to the doubts and depressions of the people who were suffering from the Babylonian Exile. The people thought that God had abandoned them and that he no longer was interested in their fate: "But Zion said, 'The Lord has forsaken me, my Lord has forgotten me'" (Isa. 49:14). The exilic prophet accused the people of saying that their way was hidden from the Lord and that their right was disregarded by their God (40:27). Exilic Isaiah ministers to the captives by reminding them of what they had formerly believed and had confessed in their homeland (40:28, "Have you not known? Have you not heard?"). He attempted to reawaken the living memories which they already possessed; drawing upon oral and written prophecies, psalms, and sacred traditions of old Israel, Exilic Isaiah dramatically recalled the glory and blessings which the people of God had experienced in the past. The covenant relationship between God and his people was based upon the grace and mercy of Israel's God and could not be terminated or destroyed by the events of the Exile.[107] All the sacred past is focused upon the present decisive moment in which God was about to re-enact the history of the salvation of his people;[108] the captivity of Israel would soon come to an end, and Israel would be returned to the land which God had promised to their fathers.[109] Therefore, Exilic Isaiah makes a fervent appeal for Israel to return to her ancestral origins.[110] Evidently, the Jacob tradition held a prominent position in the sacred traditions to which Exilic Isaiah had access.[111]

---

[105] Von Rad, loc. cit.

[106] The term "Exilic Isaiah" designates the tradition of Isaiah of Jerusalem which was associated with the Babylonian Exile. Whether Exilic Isaiah was a creative leader of a school or a school of prophets is not crucial to this study. Cf. Donald L. Williams, "The Message of the Exilic Isaiah," Review and Expositor, LXV:423-32, 1968.

Jacob and Israel

No less than seventeen times "Jacob" and "Israel" are used in parallel lines in Isaiah 40-49 (40:27; 41:8, 14; 42:24; 43:1, 22, 28; 44:1, 5, 21, 23; 45:4; 46:3; 48:1, 12;

---

[107] Rolf Rendtorff, _Men of the Old Testament_, trans. by Frank Clarke, p. 103.

[108] James Muilenburg, "The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 40-66: Introduction and Exegesis," IB, Vol. 5, p. 412.

[109] Rendtorff, _op_. _cit_., p. 104.

[110] Muilenburg, _op_. _cit_., p. 404.

[111] The name "Jacob" occurs 22 times in Isa. 40-49.

49:5, 6).[112] In all but one instance (41:8) Jacob occurs before Israel in the parallel construction. Whether Exilic Isaiah is consciously utilizing the parallel construction as the two names appear in the pentateuchal traditions (Jacob before Israel) or whether the name Jacob held some mysterious pre-eminence over Israel is not apparent. In general, the Jacob-Israel parallel is the psychic-religious-political unity which includes the past, present, and future history and personality of the people who are related to God in a covenant relationship. Jacob is placed in parallel with Jeshurun[113] once (44:2), but Jeshurun also may be considered a Jacob-Israel parallel. Although Jacob appears five other times in Isaiah 50-66 (58:1, 14; 59:20; 60:16; 65:9), not once in these sixteen chapters is Jacob in direct parallel with Israel. In comparison, Israel occurs without Jacob twenty-three times in Isaiah 40-55; eighteen times Israel is part of a phrase referring to God, and only five times does Israel designate something other than the God of Israel (44:21; 45:17, 25; 46:13; 49:3[114]).

---

[112] The LXX has a Jacob-Israel parallel in Isa. 42:1.

[113] The LXX interpreted Jeshurun as Israel. In Deut. 33:5, the Lord becomes king of Jeshurun when the elders of all the tribes of Israel are gathered together (cf. Deut. 32:15; 33:26), and the listing of the twelve tribes of Israel follows.

[114] "Israel" is lacking in Q and 534 of the LXX; it is also absent in Kennicott 96 of the Hebrew. A careful

Of the six occurrences of Israel in Isaiah 56-66 (56:8; 60:9, 14; 63:7, 16; 66:20) only two refer to the God of Israel (60:9, 14).

These statistical data indicate that Exilic Isaiah exercised care in the utilization of the names Jacob and Israel. Exilic Isaiah is so meticulous in the use of this poetic parallel that rarely can either Jacob or Israel be used without the other; this stylistic trait may reflect a desire of the prophet to emphasize the religious aspect of the religio-socio-political community which the Jacob-Israel parallel represented. The absence of the Jacob-Israel parallel in Isaiah 50-66 is either stylistic evidence of the expansion of the work of Exilic Isaiah or is an indication that a precise designation of the covenant community of Yahweh as Jacob-Israel was not needed or was no longer appropriate in Isaiah 50-66.[115] B. J. Van der Merwe judiciously comments that Exilic Isaiah made a distinction between the people of God and the historical Jacob-Israel. In Isaiah 40-49, the people of God are conceived as

---

study of this text led H. M. Orlinsky, "The So-Called 'Servant of the Lord' and 'Suffering Servant' in Second Isaiah," Studies on the Second Part of the Book of Isaiah, "Supplements to Vetus Testamentum," Vol. XIV, pp. 81-89, to conclude that "Israel" had no place in Isa. 49:3 (p. 88).

[115] The stratum of the work of Exilic Isaiah is evident in Isa. 56-66, but a younger redactor has freely expanded the work of Exilic Isaiah.

Jacob-Israel, but the people as a whole could not be called Jacob-Israel in Isaiah 50-66.[116] The prophet turns from the unfaithful nation as a whole and speaks directly to those who are humbly open and willing to obey.[117] In Isaiah 40-49 Jacob-Israel is thought of in terms of what the whole people could become, but the realization settles upon Exilic Isaiah that the whole nation could not become the people that God wanted them to be. Thus, the people of God are not referred to as Jacob-Israel in Isaiah 50-66; other expressions are used to designate the people who are included in the covenant community of God in Isaiah 50-66.

Jacob and the Exodus Theology

In many instances Exilic Isaiah used Jacob to allude to those who identified themselves with the history of God's salvation of his people which began in the Exodus. The journey of Jacob and his sons to Egypt is considered to be the point at which God called his people (Isa. 52:4). Jacob's return from Babylonian Exile would verify the election of Israel in Egypt (Isa. 52:8; cf. 43:1ff.). By re-establishing the old clan alliance of the tribes of

---

[116] _Pentateuchtradisies in die Prediking van Deuterojesaja_, p. 262.

[117] James D. Smart, _History and Theology in Second Isaiah_, p. 179.

Jacob the Exodus redemption could be re-enacted in the Exile (Isa. 49:6).[118] Since Yahweh is the King of Jacob (not David), the captives of Babylon can depend on God to rescue the sons of Jacob (Isa. 41:21). Consequently, by identifying themselves with the house of Jacob, the exiled Israelites could become a part of the Exodus from Babylon.

Exilic Isaiah implies that the Exile is the result of a series of acts of unfaithfulness which began in Egypt (Isa. 43:27).[119] Yahweh had delivered Jacob to Babylon because Jacob had transgressed against God and had ceased to be the people which God elected in Egypt (Isa. 42:23). The chain of disloyalty to Yahweh's covenant with Jacob and his sons began in Egypt and extended into Babylon. The fact that judgment had occurred for Jacob is an ironical vindication of God's covenant with Israel.[120]

However, deliverance and restoration from the Exile could be accomplished by the God who had saved Jacob from

---

[118] Von Rad, Theology, Vol. II, p. 253.

[119] Commentators have erred in attempting to identify the sin of the "first father." The sin of Jacob, the first father, is the unfaithfulness of those who experienced the Exodus, i.e., the sons of Jacob. The sin of Jacob is not the deception and pride which are revealed in the pentateuchal stories; the sin of Jacob resulted in being lost in the desert for forty years. The sin of Jacob also resulted in the Exile.

[120] Peter R. Ackroyd, Exile and Restoration, pp. 121-28.

Egypt (Isa. 48:20). The changing of the name of the "house of Jacob" to "Israel" (Isa. 48:1) is an allusion to the blessing associated with the change of Jacob's name in Genesis 32:28f. and 35:9-13. Jacob-Israel would receive the blessing of the land which was promised to the descendants of Jacob. The election of Jacob in the new Exodus from Babylon would be fulfilled in a new Settlement experence. The return to the land which was promised to Jacob and his descendants would confirm God's concern for his people (cf. Isa. 10:20; Mic. 2:12; 5:7, 8; Jer. 30:10, 18; 31:7, 11; Ezek. 20:5; 28:25; 37:25; 39:25).[121]

Exilic Isaiah has shown a definite preference for the election traditions of the patriarchs and the Exodus and has given very little attention to the Zion-David traditions.[122] No longer is the throne in Jerusalem to be occupied by an heir of the Davidic dynasty; the everlasting covenant with David was related to the mission and destiny of Israel as servants of Yahweh (Isa. 55:1-5).[123]

---

[121] Cf. von Rad, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 165.

[122] Ibid., Vol. I, p. 47, "We have every ground for assuming that the David-Zion tradition was fostered in Jerusalem and Judah, while the patriarchal-Exodus tradition lived on in the Northern Kingdom."

[123] Otto Eissfeldt, "The Promises of Grace to David in Isaiah 55:1-5," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, ed. by B. W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson, pp. 196-207.

The interpretation of the tragedy of the Exile was based upon traditions that antedated the monarchy of David. Exilic Isaiah revived the traditions of the Exodus experience which had been overshadowed by the Davidic traditions in Judah. The prominence of Jacob and the Exodus in Exilic Isaiah evokes the suggestion that Exilic Isaiah may have worked in the Mizpah sanctuary, of which very little is known (II Kgs. 25:23; Jer. 40:6). If the Mizpah of I Samuel 7 is the same as the one mentioned in II Kings 25:23, Mizpah would be the only one of the shrines of the pre-monarchical confederacy which survived the Exile. Furthermore, if the anti-monarchical attitude in Mizpah (I Sam. 7) was associated with the anti-monarchical feelings which obviously were engendered by the conscription of the house of Joseph for forced labor (I Kgs. 12:28ff.), Mizpah likely continued to harbor resentment toward Jerusalem. Thus, an anti-monarchical attitude in Mizpah would contribute to the supplanting of the Davidic traditions in the work of Exilic Isaiah.

The Post-Exilic Jacob Tradition

Sources for an examination of the post-exilic Jacob tradition can be limited to a few references in Isaiah 56-66, Malachi, elements in a few psalms, and the Priestly stratum of the Pentateuch. Only a general outline of the history of the Jacob tradition can be re-constructed for this period.

Jacob in Isaiah 56-66

Because not all of Isaiah 56-66 is the work of the disciples of Exilic Isaiah at a given time, each passage in this section must be evaluated independently.[124] The work of the disciples presupposes the Exile and deals with the malcontent of the Israelites who have returned and have not found the situation as prosperous as they had dreamed. Although the Jacob tradition appears only five times in Isaiah 56-66 (58:1, 14; 59:20; 65:9), a historical sketch can be drawn from these few references.

The people who had returned from the Exile had not received the blessing which they had anticipated (Isa. 58, esp. vv. 11ff.). The people had called themselves Jacob (58:1), but they were not the true Jacob because they had transgressed against God. If they would turn to Yahweh, they could expect great blessings. Yahweh will give the land to his people; Palestine belongs to Yahweh, and he will feed his people with the heritage of their father

---

[124] Otto Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction*, trans. by Peter R. Ackroyd, p. 345, suggested that some parts of Isa. 56-66 are much older than the last third of the sixth century; he dates a few passages soon after 587 B.C.

Jacob (Isa. 58:14; cf. Gen. 28:13-14).[125] Evidently, the Israelites returned to Palestine and found their land had been confiscated by the "poor people who owned nothing" (Jer. 39:10). However, a note in Isaiah 65:9 states that only the chosen and the servants will be permitted to dwell in the land of promise. The dispossessed are to be vindicated as the true inheritors of the land if they will appropriate the spiritual heritage of Jacob. The speaker made a valiant effort to give a contemporary relevance to the old traditions in which the nation had made lamentation before God as a unit, but Yahweh would only come to Zion as a Redeemer for those who had turned from their transgression (Isa. 59:20).[126]

Isaiah 56-66 displays a very high regard for the Jacob tradition. Jacob has taken the place of David as the figure around whom the election of Israel gravitates; David is not mentioned one time in Isaiah 56-66. That Jacob maintains his prestige in the context of Jerusalem shows what the promise to Jacob meant to the Judeans during the restoration of Jerusalem. For the first time since the reigns of David and Solomon, Jacob was recognized as a true patriarch in Jerusalem.

---

[125] James Muilenburg, "The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 40-66: Introduction and Exegesis," IB, Vol. 5, p. 686.

[126] James Smart, _History and Theology in Second Isaiah_, p. 255; Claus Westermann, _Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary_, trans. by D. M. G. Stalker, p. 352.

Jacob in Malachi

Sometime between 520 B.C. and 400 B.C.[127] an unidentified prophet delivered an oracle in which the Jacob tradition was included (Mal. 1:2). The temple had been rebuilt, but the assurance of the divine presence which was supposed to have had its locus in the temple was open to question because of a continuing delay. The author of Malachi was a preacher-moralist who was trying to recall a tradition to minds which were already familiar with it. The prophet made a renewed affirmation of the reality of the covenant relationship between Yahweh and Israel on the basis of the election of Jacob ("I have loved Jacob") and the rejection of Esau, who becomes the symbol of the outside and hostile world.[128]

The Jacob figure has assumed an almost exclusive stance in the election traditions of Israel.[129] Jacob clearly is the father of the true people of God (Mal. 2:10, 12). A division between the faithless and the faithful inhabitants of Jerusalem and Judah is recognized by Malachi, and the people who identify themselves with the covenant people of Jacob are the ones whom Yahweh will favor and deliver (Mal. 3:6).

---

[127] Eissfeldt, _op_. _cit_., pp. 442-43.

[128] Peter R. Ackroyd, _Exile and Restoration_, pp. 230-31.

[129] H. W. Robinson, _Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament_, pp. 152-53.

At this point in the history of the Jacob tradition Jacob has achieved an idealized position in the store of the traditions of Judah. Jacob has now assumed a prominent place in the covenant traditions of Judah and can naturally be included in the company of the Exodus, Sinai, and Settlement traditions.

Post-Exilic Significance of Jacob in Psalms

A few references to the Jacob tradition can be detected in a few psalms. The history of the tradition of Jacob in Psalms must be reconstructed from that which can be inferred from references to the Davidic covenant, election of Israel, and the promise of land, since these themes have been found to be used in connection with the Jacob tradition.

The Exile posed a formidable problem for cultic officials who had interpreted the "everlasting covenant of David" to mean that a Davidic heir would always be on the throne in Jerusalem. This misinterpretation of the covenant traditions of Israel is corrected in Psalm 105.[130] The "everlasting covenant" is traced back to Abraham and is confirmed to Jacob as an everlasting covenant which states, "To you I will give the land of Canaan as your portion for an inheritance" (Psalm 105:11). Yahweh is mindful of the everlasting covenant, but the nature of the covenant was a promise and fulfillment scheme. The promise was fulfilled by the Settlement of the land by the sons of Jacob (vv. 42-44). This reinterpretation of the Davidic covenant was necessitated by the extermination of the Davidic dynasty.

The reactions of the "captives of Jacob" who were returned from Babylonian Exile are described in Psalm 85 (cf. Psalm 14:7). What God had already done (vv. 1-3) was an invocation to the prayer that God would be gracious in their present misery. When the returned Exiles realized the plight of the captives of Jacob, they lifted their lament to Yahweh, who had settled Jacob in Canaan and who had returned the captives of Jacob to the land which they had been promised.

---

[130] The fact that I Chron. 16:8-22 quoted Psalm 105: 1-15 along with the Enthronement Psalm 96 and Psalm 106:47-48 in connection with the transfer of the Ark to Zion means that Psalm 105 was interpreted in the days of the Chronicler as a hymn of thanksgiving which was addressed to the bearers of the covenant tradition and which celebrated the election of the house of David. The key to interpreting Psalm 105 is the absence of the election of David.

A call to praise Yahweh (Psalm 135) because he has chosen Jacob (v. 4) is followed by a recital of the deeds of Yahweh which vindicated the election of Jacob. The culmination of these acts of Yahweh is the giving of the land as a heritage to the chosen people of Israel (v. 12). The need for assurance of Yahweh's enduring renown, for vindication of his people, and for compassion on his servants (vv. 13-14) fits the context of the Exile, but this dating is far from conclusive.

Psalms 146-150 all begin and end with the refrain, "Praise the Lord"; these psalms formed part of the later Jewish daily morning service.[131] The shattering disillusionment, the poverty, and injustice which are evidenced in these psalms reflect the annihilation of the Davidic lineage early in the post-Exilic period. In Psalm 146,[132] the worshippers have placed their confidence in a seat of power which they thought had failed them in a crisis. The absence of a connection of David with Zion and Jerusalem suggests that recalling God's establishment of the Davidic monarchy in Zion was no longer uplifting. This vacuum which was left by David was filled by the revival of the old tradition of how Yahweh had favored Jacob (v. 5). Thus, Jacob has supplanted David as the representative of Israel's election, and the Davidic kingship has become an eschatological hope to be fulfilled in the future.

---

[131] J. H. Eaton, Psalms, "Torch Bible Commentaries," pp. 310-11.

[132] Psalm 147 reflects the same attitude toward the election of Jacob as does Psalm 146.

The transfer of the exilic capital to Mizpah (II Kgs. 25:23; Jer. 40:6) presents an ideal occasion for the Jacob traditions of election to supplant the Davidic traditions. Here the northern traditions would stand in a favorable position when the reorganization of worship took place.

The centrality of Jerusalem in the world view of Psalm 87 emphasizes that the origin and existence of all nations is based upon the order and stability of the universe which has its citadel in Jerusalem.[133] Zion, the mother of believers everywhere, brings praise to Yahweh because his sanctuary is located there (v. 3). However, the "dwelling places of Jacob" are placed in contrast to the "gates of Zion" which Yahweh loves (v. 2). The dwelling places of Jacob represent a threat to the gates of Zion in the mind of the psalmist. By metonymy, the dwelling places of Jacob designate the shrines which could rival the claim of Jerusalem as the center of the worship of Yahweh. The mention of Babylon as a former enemy who has become a friend of God presupposes the Exile (v. 4). This disparagement of the dwelling places of Jacob reflects a context in which attempts were made to establish territorial sanctuaries outside Jerusalem; the psalmist appeals for a rejection of these shrines along with their earlier traditions (cf. Psalm 78:68ff.).[134] This rivalry between Jacob and Zion may have occurred during the reorganization of a cult at the Mizpah sanctuary during the Exile. If this passage does reflect exilic events around the Mizpah sanctuary, later material would indicate that the election tradition of Jacob was preferred in the rivalry with the election tradition of David.

---

[133] Harvey H. Guthrie, Jr., _Israel's Sacred Songs_, p. 93.

The Priestly Redaction of the Jacob Tradition

Although the Priestly stratum of the Pentateuch contributed no long or complete narrative of the Jacob tradition, the isolated remarks and notations furnish enough material to determine P's handling of the Jacob tradition.[135] P has purged the Jacob tradition of all objectionable and doubtful features and has idealized the Jacob figure in a bare, factual editing of the earlier accounts of the Jacob tradition. The P stratum of the Jacob tradition reflects the exilic dilemma in which the people of Israel found themselves at the moment at which the whole structure of their life seemed to have collapsed.[136] Two themes which have been observed in the other post-exilic materials appear quite prominently in the Priestly version of the Jacob tradition; the P treatment of the Jacob tradition is concerned primarily with the promise of land and the narrowing of election.

---

[134] Artur Weiser, *The Psalms: A Commentary*, trans. by Herbert Hartwell, p. 581.

[135] P is accepted as a school of redactors who began their work in the early history of Israel and continued until the Exile and beyond. Cf. E. A. Speiser, *Genesis*, "The Anchor Bible," p. xxvi. Also, see Ackroyd, *op. cit.*, pp. 84-102.

When Jacob is about to embark upon his journey to Paddan-aram to obtain a wife from the house of Laban, Jacob is blessed by Isaac. In the midst of this blessing an appeal is made to El Shaddai to transfer the blessing of Abraham to Jacob and his descendants. The intention of that blessing was "that you may take possession of the land of your sojournings which God gave to Abraham!" (Gen. 28:4). Upon Jacob's return from Paddan-aram, the promise of land is renewed in the context of a colorless theophany and the change of Jacob's name to Israel.[137] A primary concern of this text is to insure that the promise to

---

[136] Ackroyd, _op_. _cit_., p. 84.

[137] Gerhard von Rad, _Genesis_: _A_ _Commentary_, trans. by John H. Marks, pp. 333-34, commented that this pericope (35:9-13) summarizes in essence the theological significance of Gen. 28:10ff. (JE) and 32:23ff. (J), i.e., the promise of land and the change of name.

Abraham is completely renewed to Jacob.[138] This promise is recalled on the occasion of Jacob's blessing of the sons of Joseph (Gen. 48:3-7); here the land is promised to Jacob's descendants as an "everlasting possession."

Underlying this promise of land is a structural pattern in which P wishes to show Yahweh's achievement of the reality of his own people. Thus, the promise to Jacob is brought into relation with the Exodus and Settlement under the arch of tension between promise and fulfillment.[139] Even the possession of a burial plot is interpreted by P to be a down-payment of their share in the fulfillment of the promise to be settled in the land (Gen. 49:28b-33; 50:12-13; cf. 17:6-8).[140] The primary emphasis of the promise of land to Jacob is laid upon the anticipatory possession of the land.[141] This anticipation reflects the uncertainty of possession of the land which the returned captives experienced in the Exile.

---

[138] _Ibid_., p. 334.

[139] Walther Zimmerli, "Promise and Fulfillment," trans. by James Wharton, _Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics_, ed. by Claus Westermann, pp. 89-122. Cf. _idem_, "Die Grundlagen der Hoffnungsstruktur der alten Geschichtsberichte Israels. Der Bericht der Priesterschrift," _Der Mensch und seine Hoffnung im Alten Testament_, pp. 66-81.

[140] Gerhard von Rad, "The Promised Land and Yahweh's Land in the Hexateuch," _The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays_, trans. E. W. Trueman Dicken, p. 90.

[141] Ackroyd, _op. cit_., p. 97.

A progressive narrowing of the election of Israel can be detected in the election and blessing of Jacob in the Priestly stratum. P begins with the Creation, focuses upon Noah, then Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, the sons of Jacob, and through them to the special position occupied by Judah and the priests.[142] P is concerned to show that Jacob was the recipient of the blessing and favor of El Shaddai, the God who appeared to Abram (cf. Gen. 17:1). Jacob is presented as a man with possessions in Paddan-aram (Gen. 31:18); he also gained cattle and goods and many offspring in Canaan (Gen. 46:6-8). In Egypt he received the blessing of increase and a favorable dwelling place in Egypt (Gen. 46: 8-27; 47:5b-6a, 7-11, 27-28; 48:3-4). P interprets the sayings of Jacob to the twelve tribes of Israel as a blessing (Gen. 49:28b). Jacob is the man of blessing as Abraham is interpreted by P as the man of covenant.[143]

Therefore, Jacob obeys his parents and is not corrupted by a mixed marriage with a Canaanite (Gen. 28:1-9). The polygamous relationship which was responsible for the large number of sons is made respectable by furnishing Jacob with the maids of Leah and Rachel (Gen. 30:4, 9, etc.). When Isaac dies, the friction between Jacob and Esau is put aside to permit the proper burial of Isaac (Gen. 35:29). The ancestor of the "sons of Israel" must be suitable for the role which God intended for his chosen people. This stress on purification and idealization of the Jacob tradition is a recognition of the needs of the exilic situation of the sixth century B.C. Although the Priestly work purports to be a description of the past glory of Jacob and to that end projects its ideals into the past, P is in reality concerned with the anticipatory receiving of the land and with what the restored community would be like.[144]

---

[142] _Ibid_., p. 92.

[143] Walter Gross, "Jakob, der Mann des Segen," _Biblica_, 49:321-44, 1968.

Summary

A common interpretation of the Jacob tradition runs through the exilic literature; the prophets and psalmists turn their attention to the ancient traditions of Israel for a message of hope and encouragement. Jacob is a representative of the covenant people who experienced salvation in the Exodus. The election of Jacob in the Exodus was extended into the new Exodus experience by deliverance from the Exile and resettlement in the land of promise.

---

[144] Ackroyd, op. cit., pp. 98-102.

A certain narrowing of the election traditions came to focus upon Jacob in the post-exilic material. Jacob has taken the place of David as the election figure, and the election is narrowed to include only the faithful remnant. Outsiders are interpreted as those whom Yahweh does not favor (Mal.).

D. TRANSMISSION OF JACOB TRADITION IN JUDAH

The transfer of the Jacob tradition from the northern tribes of Joseph to the Judean cult can be associated with the diplomatic measures of the house of David to obtain the recognition of the election of David and Jerusalem by the northern tribes. When the Ark was brought to Jerusalem by David, the shrine in Jerusalem became an attraction for northern pilgrims and northern traditions. A group of cultic persons in Jerusalem whom critics designate as J fused these northern traditions with their own stock of traditions. Keeping in mind the desire to show how Yahweh had chosen David to rule over the people of God from Jerusalem, J arranged the traditions in a promise-fulfillment framework so that the establishment of the house of David and the extension of the Davidic possession of land was interpreted as the fulfillment of the promise of land which was given to Jacob. In order to safeguard the pre-eminence of the southern perspective of the traditions a genealogical history was constructed by placing Abraham and Isaac before Jacob. The unity of the various districts of the kingdom of David and Solomon was emphasized by applying the names of the tribes and districts to the twelve sons of Jacob. Thus, Jacob was recognized as a patriarch in Judah; that Jacob was known in the southern kingdom before David is not impossible if the Hebrew tribes were a part of the Amorite-Habiru unrest in Palestine during the Late Bronze Age and during the Early Iron Age, but Jacob became a patriarch in Judah as a result of the attempt to establish the election of David and Jerusalem.

So much stress was placed upon the election of David that the northern traditions of which Jacob was a part became secondary and were not used as prominently in the worship and national affairs as were the Davidic traditions. These northern traditions remained imbedded in the national epics and in the cultic materials, but the Jacob tradition was subordinate to the Davidic and Abrahamic traditions.

During the latter quarter of the eighth century B.C. the threats of the Assyrians, Syrians, and North Israel to the throne in Jerusalem prompted a school of prophecy to reconsider the election traditions of Judah. Isaiah of Jerusalem and Micah called attention to the possibility of judgment upon Judah because of their violation of the covenant which God had made. The cultic persons who fled to

Jerusalem after the fall of North Israel (722 B.C.) would have been pleased to see a return to the covenant which was based upon the Exodus-Sinai experience.

The Exile was interpreted by the exilic prophets as a confirmation of God's judgment upon Israel (Judah and Israel) because of their disloyalty to the covenant which God had confirmed in the Exodus-Sinai-Settlement experience. The Jacob figure was used to represent the true covenant people who experienced the series of the acts of God in the deliverance from Egypt. If Israel would become sons of Jacob, the promise to Jacob could be fulfilled again through a new Exodus from Babylon and a new Settlement experience in the land which was promised to Jacob.

When the captives returned to their homeland, they found that their land had been confiscated by the poor people who had been left in the land of Palestine. Those who had returned from the Exile soon gained positions of leadership in the realm of politics and religion. Consequently, a narrowing of the election traditions is observed in the post-exilic literature; the promise of the land is limited to the sons of Jacob who had experienced the new Exodus from Babylon. The remnant is interpreted as those who are a part of the true covenant community, i.e., the house of Jacob. The Davidic figure is elevated to the realm of an ideal expectation, but Jacob has become the figure who is loved and elected by God; then Esau becomes the representative of those who are not a part of the true covenant community.

CHAPTER IV

THE JACOB TRADITION AND THE NORTHERN KINGDOM

CHAPTER IV

THE JACOB TRADITION AND THE NORTHERN KINGDOM

An investigation of the Jacob tradition in the northern kingdom of Israel is impaired by the nature of the present text of the sources and by the lack of definitive studies of northern traditions. The presence of North Israelite literature in the Old Testament is at best no more than scanty remains.[1] Even the prophecies of the northern prophets were collected and written down as literature in a Judean milieu. To quote again the succinct statement of Mowinckel, "Every tradition that has come to us has passed through Jerusalemite mouths and pens. . . ."[2] If much help is to be obtained from the Old Testament literature, an attempt must be made to get behind the present text of the appearances of Jacob, and this task becomes formidable when very many texts in various types of literature are to be studied.

Previous studies of the northern traditions have been concerned with the source-critical problems of the Tetrateuch and Deuteronomy. Beginning with the last two decades of the nineteenth century, the Elohistic source generally has been recognized as originating in North Israel.[3] The northern origin of Deuteronomy was first suggested by C. F. Burney[4] and has been maintained by A. C. Welch[5] and others. However, very little effort has been made to study the phenomenon of the northern traditions. A recent exception to this lack of a phenomenological study of northern traditions is a dissertation done at Harvard by A. W. Jenks.[6] Although Jenks is concerned with a hypothesis of an independent E tradition, he views E as an expression of the religious views and emphases which can be discerned in a whole stream of northern Israelite literature from the Samuel traditions to the Book of Deuteronomy.[7] Extensive study of the phenomenon of northern traditions is greatly needed to facilitate the reconstruction of the history of the Jacob tradition, as well as other individual traditions.

---

[1] Sigmund Mowinckel, "Israelite Historiography," Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute, Vol. II, p. 21.

[2] Idem, "Tradition, Oral," IDB, Vol. R-Z, p. 683.

---

[3] Cf. Abraham Kuenen, _An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch_, trans. by Philip H. Wicksteed, pp. 248-70. Georg Fohrer, _Introduction to the Old Testament_, trans. by David E. Green, p. 158, summarized the arguments for the northern origin of E.

[4] _The Book of Judges with Introduction and Notes_, p. xlvi.

[5] _The Code of Deuteronomy A New Theory of Its Origin_, pp. 34, 39, 76, _et passim_.

[6] "The Elohist and North Israelite Traditions" (unpublished Th.D. thesis).

[7] _Ibid._, p. iii.

Recognizing the limitations, the following study of the Jacob tradition in North Israel is pursued with the hope that something can be learned about the significance of the Jacob tradition for North Israel. At the same time, it is hoped that the need and opportunity for further study in this area will be observed.

A. JACOB AND JEROBOAM I

After the death of Solomon (*ca*. 922 B.C.), Rehoboam was presented with an appeal from the ten northern tribes to lessen the oppressive policies which Solomon had practiced (I Kgs. 12:1-16). When Rehoboam replied to Israel's demands with a threat of heavier taxes and harsher treatment, the ten tribes which had met at Shechem to crown Rehoboam rebelled against Rehoboam and asked Jeroboam, son of Nebat, to become king of North Israel (I Kgs. 12:16-20). The environment which the reign of Jeroboam created was conducive for the cultivation and growth of the Jacob tradition in North Israel.

Although the oppressive measures of Solomon and the arrogance of Rehoboam were primarily responsible for the schism of the United Kingdom, an independent spirit of the older order had existed in North Israel all along and had reasserted itself in the secession of the ten northern tribes. The self-consciousness and the traditions of the northern tribes were far from dormant, and the Ephraimite, Jeroboam, appeared to be the man whom Yahweh had anointed to lead the Israelites back to a more ancient order.[8] Ahijah had indicated that Jeroboam would become the leader of the ten northern tribes (I Kgs. 11:31), and Jeroboam's appointment implied a return to the method of charismatic leadership which had prevailed in the period before the establishment of the monarchy.[9]

The fact that Ahijah was from Shiloh is not without significance since the northern tribes of Joseph had considered Shiloh as a tribal sanctuary ever since the period of the Settlement of the tribes in Canaan. The house of Joseph was the group of forced laborers over whom Jeroboam was placed in charge during the reign of Solomon (I Kgs. 11:28). Thus, the house of Joseph was very influential in this appeal to return to the ancient traditions of Israel.

In order to divert the attention of the northern tribes away from Jerusalem where the sacred Ark was located, Jeroboam reorganized the Yahweh cult on the basis of old traditions which were characteristic of the northern tribes. He set up bull symbols in Bethel and Dan,[10] and at Bethel he revived a northern version of the Feast of Ingathering, a harvest festival at the end of the agricultural festival at the conclusion of the agricultural year (I Kgs. 12:33). In the southern kingdom this feast was the occasion of the celebration of Yahweh's eternal covenant with the house of David (I Kgs. 8:2). The northern version of this feast probably revived the central place of the Exodus traditions (cf. Lev. 23:43-P) which had become secondary to David in the southern feast. Priests who were not of the proper order of the Levites[11] were chosen by Jeroboam to officiate at the official sanctuaries of North Israel. Jeroboam's actual participation in the sacrifices is frowned upon by the Deuteronomic Historian, but earlier the king often had a priestly function in the cult (I Sam. 13:8ff.; 14:31-35; II Sam. 6:12-19; 24:25; I Kgs. 3:15).[12]

---

[8] John Bright, A History of Israel, p. 211.

[9] Martin Noth, The History of Israel, 2nd ed., trans. by P. R. Ackroyd, p. 228.

---

[10] Deities were often represented as enthroned on the back of a bull. Since Jeroboam was reviving what was already familiar instead of creating something entirely new, bull symbolism may have already been a part of the religion of the northern tribes. Whether there is a connection with the golden calves of Aaron (Ex. 32:1-8) is debatable (cf. Hos. 8:5, 6; 10:5; 13:2). Cf. E. W. Heaton, The Hebrew Kingdoms, Vol. III of "The New Clarendon Bible," pp. 73-74.

[11] Bright, op. cit., p. 217, suggested that Jeroboam's priests were of the Aaronic line (Jerusalem denied Aaron).

[12] Cf. Aubrey R. Johnson, Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel, 2nd ed., pp. 13ff.

Jeroboam's occupation of Penuel undoubtedly had a strong relationship to the strong anti-Jerusalem sentiments of the region of Shiloh and East-Jordan.[13] If the traditions at Shechem were earlier related to the Canaanite cult of "Israel," a move to Penuel would have been in the direction of the nomadic traditions of the Joseph tribes.[14] Thus, Tirzah would have become a compromise, as was Jerusalem for David when he moved the capital from Hebron to Jerusalem.[15]

The Jacob tradition would have been very much at home in the system of worship which Jeroboam reorganized in the northern kingdom. Jacob was a very important figure in the house of Joseph, the group which seemed to have been in strong opposition to Solomon (I Kgs. 11:28). A return to the old traditions of the Joseph tribes would certainly mean that Jacob was an important figure in the northern traditions after Jeroboam. Note is also taken of the sites of Jeroboam's administrative and cultic activities. Shechem is the location of the fusion of the Jacob tradition with the Canaanite traditions of a figure called Israel (Gen. 33:18-20; 34). Jacob had received a theophany at the Bethel sanctuary (Gen. 28) and at the holy place of Penuel (Gen. 32). The Jacob tradition would have been very strong at these sites which figured prominently in the affairs of Jeroboam.

---

[13] John Gray, I and II Kings: A Commentary, p. 290, saw Jeroboam's move as an attempt to influence the remnants of David's kingdom in East-Jordan.

[14] Jeroboam could have withdrawn to Penuel in the face of Sheshonk's invasion of Palestine in 918 B.C. Cf. Heaton, op. cit., p. 73. Eduward Nielsen, Shechem, pp. 191-92, theorized that Shechem and Penuel were on opposite ends of an important caravan route.

[15] The location of Tirzah has been proposed to be in the general vicinity of Samaria. Tell el-Far'ah is accepted by G. E. Wright, "The Excavation of Tell el-Far'ah," BA, XII:66-68, 1949.

B. THE ELOHISTIC JACOB TRADITION

Assuming that the Elohistic stratum of the Pentateuch is the vestige of traditions which thrived in the northern sanctuaries from 922-722 B.C., the Elohistic version of the Pentateuch should contain evidence of the nature and the significance of the Jacob tradition in North Israel. Since E was not an individual or even a group who worked at a particular time, a particular style and vocabulary cannot be used to identify verses and phrases as Elohistic. Elohistic traditions can be said to exist only in passages which have "constants" which can be identified as the style and interests of the Elohistic point of view.[16] Alan W.

---

[16] Aage Bentzen, Introduction to the Old Testament, 3rd ed., Vol. II, pp. 26ff., used the term "constants" to refer to various phenomena which appear again and again as "the scarlet thread" which leads through the bulk of the

Jenks has identified the following patriarchal interests of E in Genesis 12-50: (1) interest and acquaintance with prophecy and problems of revelation; (2) use of dreams and visions as mediums of revelation; (3) idealization of patriarchal behavior; (4) emphasis on divine guidance, themes of obedience and testing, and disparaging of foreign gods.[17] The northern provenance of E can be inferred from the following conspicuous features: (1) the prominence of Jacob and Joseph at the expense of Abraham and Isaac; (2) emphasis on traditions upon which Jeroboam based his cultic measures (I Kgs. 12:28-33); (3) a special interest in northern sanctuaries; (4) concern for the graves of the ancestors in North Israel (Gen. 35:8, 19-20; also Josh. 24:30-33); (5) the apparent influence of E upon Hosea and Deuteronomy, both of which were originally northern.[18] A passage which is identified as E should have either parallels which are sufficiently distinct to reveal a tendency or should be of sufficient length to determine that a separate perspective is present in the tradition.

---

traditions. The combination of these constants will reveal traces of the time, place, and occasion that motivated the formation of the Elohistic traditions.

[17] "The Elohist and North Israelite Traditions" (unpublished Th.D. thesis), p. 134.

[18] Fohrer, op. cit., p. 158.

The present text of the Pentateuch in which the Jacob tradition is preserved (Gen. 25-50) is obviously a blending of the Elohistic traditions with Yahwistic traditions.[19] Therefore, a study of the Elohistic Jacob tradition should use as a basis the passages in which the Elohistic style and interests are more definite; the results of this study will be compared with the use of the Jacob tradition in other collections of northern literature.

Elohistic Characterization of Jacob

In the E traditions Jacob is characterized as a wealthy prince who has been directed and blessed by God. Jacob does not acquire his wealth by his cleverness as J implied (Gen. 30:37ff.); rather Jacob obtained his herds by the help of God (Gen. 31:11ff.). Thus, Jacob is exonerated of any wrong-doing toward Laban, and the guilt was placed upon Laban (31:2, 4ff.). The removal of objectionable traits or questionable actions by justifying Jacob's behavior as a divine command or by portraying his behavior as innocent is characteristic of E (cf. Gen. 20:1-17 with 12:10-20; 21:12 with 16:6; 31:5-16 with 30:37-43; 42:13, 32 with 44:20).[20]

---

[19] Artur Weiser, The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development, trans. by Dorothea M. Barton, p. 112, identified only one passage (Gen. 28:10-12, 17-22) as an unmixed E strand. Otto Eissfeldt, The Old Testament An Introduction, trans. by Peter R. Ackroyd, pp. 200-201, added 35:1-4, 6-8, 14, 16-20, to the one passage which Weiser designated as E. Fohrer, op. cit., p. 153, accepted all of the passages which Eissfeldt called E with slight variation of a verse or two and added 26:3b-5 and 46:28-48:2 (except 47:5b-6a, 7-11). Jenks, op. cit., named the following as E: 28:11-12, 17-22; 31:4-16; 35:1-5, 7-8, 14, 16-20; 40; 41; 42 (in large part); 46:1-7; 50:15-26.

That E showed more sensitivity to the sin and moral character of Jacob and Abraham than did J can reasonably be attributed to E's acquaintance with the ethical demands of the ancient covenant relationship between Yahweh and the Joseph tribes. In Genesis 42:21-22, the distress of the brothers is attributed to their sin against Joseph (cf. Gen. 50:15ff.).

Blessing of Jacob

The blessing of Jacob in the E strand is more in terms of divine guidance than it is of fertility or possession of land. Jacob accepted Yahweh as his God on the condition that God would be with him where he went and would bring him back to his father's house (Gen. 28:20-21). The angel of God had shown Jacob how to obtain a flock from Laban (Gen. 31:9, 11-12). The God of Bethel also commands Jacob to leave Laban and return to the land of his birth (31:13). Upon his arrival at Bethel, Jacob built an altar to the God who had been with him wherever he had gone

---

[20] Robert H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, pp. 175-76.

(Gen. 35:3). Jacob is finally encouraged to sojourn to Egypt where his lost son Joseph would be present when Jacob died (Gen. 46:1-7). In Egypt, Jacob would become a great nation (Gen. 46:3); indeed, God would be with Jacob in Egypt and would bring him out of Egypt (46:4). Finally, when Jacob is about to die, he announces that God will be with Joseph and would lead him out of Egypt to the land of his ancestors (Gen. 48:21).

Evidently, E saw very little need to emphasize the promise of land to Jacob since the northern tribes already possessed most of the land of Canaan from 922 B.C. to 722 B.C. The E strand of the Jacob tradition sets the stage for the revelation of God in the Exodus and in the giving of the covenant to the sons of Jacob. The election of Israel was expressed by E as God's guidance of Israel so that Israel would arrive at the goal which God had intended for them. E's view of the divine guidance of Israel is epitomized in Joseph's consolation of his brothers: "As for you, you meant evil against me; but God meant it for good. . ." (Gen. 50:20).[21] The theological structure which the E strand of the Jacob tradition reveals above shows that the scheme is the result of theological reflection. Not a hint of the political aspects of the election of Israel is found in the E strand of the Jacob tradition.

---

[21] Weiser, op. cit., p. 114. Gerhard von Rad, "The Joseph Narrative and Ancient Wisdom," The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, trans. by E. W. Trueman Dicken, pp. 292-300, connected this verse with a wisdom movement. The court sages of Jerusalem incorporated this view into its salvation history scheme. Cf. R. N. Whybray, "The Joseph Story and Pentateuchal Criticism," VT, XVIII:522-28, 1968.

Transcendence of Jacob's God

A tendency toward viewing God as more transcendent can be observed in the E version of the Jacob tradition. God is presented as residing in heaven (Gen. 28:12) and does not wander about upon the earth. God approaches Jacob through intermediaries (Gen. 29:12; 31:11) and reveals himself to Jacob during the night and in dreams and visions (Gen. 28:12; 31:11, [24]; 46:2; [48:16]). Thus, the image of God is "de-materialized" and spiritualized, and the distance between God and man is emphasized more strongly.[22] The E strand is concerned to exalt the God of Jacob above the human world so that the Israelites would not be tempted to allow a man (king?) or another god to receive the honor which rightfully belonged to God.

Jacob's Concern with Foreign Gods

Closely connected with E's emphasis on the transcendence of Jacob's God is Jacob's concern with foreign gods

---

[22] Fohrer, _op_. _cit_., p. 157.

(Gen. 35:1-5).[23] The worship of another God is considered as apostasy from Yahweh (cf. Gen. 31:19; Exod. 32; Num. 25:1ff.; Josh. 24:14ff.; I Sam. 7:3). This absolute prohibition against foreign gods is extended to the sacred pillars (Gen. 28:18); moreover, E has a tendency to divest the pillars of their cultic character. The pillar at Bethel is represented as a memorial stone in Genesis 28; the pillar is not even mentioned when Jacob builds the altar at Bethel (Gen. 35:1-7); the pillar becomes a memorial stone for the tomb of Rachel in Genesis 35:20.[24]

E's concern with the traditions of the foreign religions reflects the historical situation and the political aspect of the cult in North Israel which is so vehemently attacked by the prophets Elijah, Amos, and Hosea. The presupposition of the call to put away foreign gods is that Yahweh had imposed a standard of conduct upon the people who had entered into a covenantal relationship with Yahweh.[25] Thus, E sounds a note of strong emphasis on the concept of a covenant between Yahweh and the sons of Jacob;

---

[23] The strong ridicule of Laban's household gods is the first appearance in the Pentateuch of an open attack on foreign gods, Jenks, op. cit., pp. 130-31.

[24] Weiser, op. cit., p. 115.

[25] R. E. Clements, Prophecy and Covenant, "Studies in Biblical Theology," No. 43, pp. 69ff.

this covenant pronounced a curse (not blessing) upon those who were polluted by fellowship with foreign gods.

Sanctuaries of Elohistic Jacob

The sanctuaries with which Jacob is associated in the E strand are almost exclusively located in North Israel (except Beersheba). Albrecht Alt has suggested that Jacob's erection of an altar at Bethel is rooted in a shift of the amphictyonic shrine from Shechem to Bethel.[26] The Bethel sanctuary is the beginning point of Jacob's journey to the east (Gen. 28:10ff.); the God of Bethel guides Jacob while he was residing with Laban (Gen. 31:13); and Jacob builds an altar at Bethel when he returns from his journey to Laban (Gen. 35:1-5, 7-8). The relevance of the bull symbol at Bethel (lit. "house of El") is explained by the use of the bull as a representation of El in Canaanite cults.[27] The connection of an El cult with Bethel antedated the settlement of Bethel by the tribes of Joseph (Judg. 1:22; cf. Josh. 12). E's interest in associating Jacob with the sanctuary at Bethel can be explained as a result of the revival of the traditions which were cherished by the tribes of Joseph, a group which favored the secession of

---

[26] "Die Wallfahrt von Sichem nach Bethel," _Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel_, Vol. I, pp. 79-88.

[27] Jenks, _op. cit._, p. 259. Cf. _supra_, n. 10.

Israel from the United Kingdom (I Kgs. 11:28). The people found no embarrassment in attributing to Yahweh the divine motifs and characteristics of El.[28] Whether Jeroboam I attempted to transpose the Canaanite royal ideology which he had learned in Jerusalem to his reorganization of worship in the northern kingdom is unclear; however, A. W. Jenks maintains that Jeroboam made a sincere effort to return to the ancient symbols and practices of an old El-Yahweh cult at Bethel.[29] Nevertheless, Bethel soon lapsed into the paganized cult which the prophets attacked (Jer. 48:13; Amos 5:5; 7:13), and even E possibly launched a polemic against the bull symbols (Exod. 32).

Jacob's connection with Beersheba (Gen. 28:10; cf. 46:1) is difficult to explain from the present texts which have been preserved. Elijah, a northern prophet, journeyed to Beersheba when he was fleeing from Jezebel (I Kgs. 19:3). Amos 5:5 and 8:14 presuppose some kind of relationship between North Israel and Beersheba. Behind these texts some reason for pilgrimages to Beersheba from North Israel was recalled in the days of Elijah and Amos, but the presence of Jacob at Beersheba in the E strand (Gen. 28:10) causes a rough transition to the Bethel episode and may not be a part of the E tradition.

---

[28] Otto Eissfeldt, "El and Yahweh," JSS, I:35-37, 1956.

[29] *Op. cit.*, pp. 259-60.

The pilgrimage of Jacob from Shechem to Bethel (Gen. 35:1-4) is connected with the measures of Jeroboam I to establish a rival to the Jerusalem cult.[30] Jeroboam had set up his capital in Shechem, but he chose Bethel and Dan as sites for the bull symbols. Could it be possible that the house of Joseph would not tolerate Jeroboam's establishment of a cultic center in Shechem because the Josephites remembered the El cult which had existed there, and consequently the capital of Jeroboam was soon moved to Penuel in the heart of the land of the Joseph tribes? Whatever the origin of the pilgrimage to Bethel was, the feast at Bethel (I Kgs. 12:32) presents a suitable occasion for the confessional renunciation of the foreign gods which Jacob appealed for at Shechem (Gen. 35:4; cf. I Sam. 7:3).

The E version of the cultic traditions of the sanctuaries with which Jacob is associated uses earlier and more precise traditions than does J (cf. also Exod. 17:15;

---

[30] Eduard Nielsen, "The Burial of Foreign Gods," Studia Theologica, VIII:103-22, 1954. Alt, *loc. cit.*, did not consider I Kgs. 12:25-33 as a possible background for a ceremonial shift of sanctuaries. The author of this study would see a connection with both Jeroboam's situation and an earlier fusion of the Jacob tradition with an El cult at Bethel.

18:12).[31] In the independent traditions of Shechem in Genesis 34 the E strand is more authentic.[32] The Jacob recension[33] of the Joseph stories is basically northern and is generally more original than is the Israel recension, which is basically from the Jerusalem perspective.

Nationalism in Elohistic Jacob

Otto Eissfeldt has noted that a strong Israelite self-consciousness and pride in the people's own special nature is expressed in E, but the link between the political and the religious is much weaker in E than in J. The nationalistic and materialistic elements do not really matter for Israel in the end; what really counts is the fact that God has appointed a people for himself and has separated this people for his own possession (Exod. 19: 5-6).[34] "The sacral and anthropological side of the idea of election is outlined and the national interests are merged completely in the religious demand."[35] "Emphasis is thus laid quite decisively upon Israel's religious heritage, and this is not simply identified with the national heritage, but stands rather in a position of tension with it."[36]

---

[31] Weiser, op. cit., pp. 113, 116. In Ephraimitic traditions E is more detailed and more learned than is J (Gen 35:8, 19; 31:20, 24; Exod. 1:11; 13:18), and thus sometimes more accurate historically (Exod. 17:14).

[32] E also correctly makes Abimelech the king of Gerar (Gen. 20:2) while J anachronistically refers to Abimelech as the king of the Philistines (Gen. 26:1).

[33] Cf. supra in chap. II under the section, "Jacob and the House of Joseph," for an explanation of the Jacob recension.

[34] Otto Eissfeldt, The Old Testament An Introduction, trans. by Peter R. Ackroyd, p. 201.

Nationalistic interests and expectations are not found in the E version of the Jacob tradition. The exclusion of other gods and the sensitivity to Jacob's moral status are breaches of a covenant which E assumes that God has already concluded with his people. The goal of Jacob's wanderings in E is not the possession of the land as it is in J; a map of Jacob's journeys shows that the goal of Jacob was to point his descendants toward Horeb--all roads lead to Horeb in E. Horeb is the place where God spoke to Israel and the place where Israel will be blessed (Exod. 32:34; 33:3; 19:4); "Horeb is thus God's real dwelling, not Canaan."[37] Election in E's Jacob tradition is verified by an awareness of the guidance and counsel of God; in short, election is confirmed by evidence of this covenant loyalty with Yahweh as the tribes had experienced while living as a confederation of tribes in a covenantal relationship with Yahweh.

---

[35] Weiser, _op_. _cit_., p. 115.

[36] Eissfeldt, _op_. _cit_., p. 202.

[37] _Ibid_.

C. NORTHERN TRADITIONS OF JACOB IN PSALMS

Some of the interests and themes of the Elohistic version of the Jacob tradition can also be detected in a few of the psalms which contain references to Jacob. The aim of this cursory treatment of northern themes which are used in connection with Jacob in certain psalms is to encourage further study of northern traditions in the Psalter. In the Asaph collection of psalms (Psalms 73-83), three psalms associate the Jacob tradition with a direct allusion to the northern kingdom.

Psalm 77

In response to the distress which is described in Psalm 77, the worshipper praises God for his great deeds in history (vv. 11-15) and for his conquest of the cosmic forces (vv. 16-20). The people who are redeemed by these mighty deeds of God are identified as "the sons of Jacob and Joseph" (v. 15). The Asaph psalms use Joseph as a representative of the northern tribes (Psalms 78:67; 80:2; 81:6). The commentaries of Mowinckel, Leslie, Briggs, Kirkpatrick, Weiser, G. W. Anderson, Gunkel, etc. see in the references to Joseph a northern setting for the origin of Psalm 77.[38] Recalling what God had done for the sons of Jacob and Joseph (those experiencing the Exodus) was a source of hope in the crisis for which this lament was intended.

Psalm 78

The history of Israel's relationship to Yahweh is treated at some length in Psalm 78. By showing the ingratitude and unfaithfulness of earlier generations the psalmist condemns the defective human response to the divine love of Yahweh who had done great things for his people throughout their history; moreover, by contrasting the gracious acts of Yahweh with the infidelity and transgression of the covenant with Yahweh, the psalmist was encouraging the worshippers to greater loyalty and fidelity to the covenant with Yahweh. The psalmist makes it clear that he is giving a theological interpretation to "the things that we have heard and known, that our fathers have told us" (Psalm 78:3).[39] The history of Joseph and Ephraim plays no small part in this psalm. The history of Joseph and Ephraim is prefaced by an account of the establishment of a "testimony in Jacob" and the appointment of a "law in Israel" (v. 5). Because the Ephraimites "did not keep God's covenant" (vv. 9-10), Yahweh kindled a fire against Jacob-Israel (v. 21).[40] After Yahweh settled the "tribes of Israel in their tents" (v. 55) in the promised land, the people rebelled against El Elyon (v. 56). Yahweh responded to Israel's rebellion by rejecting Israel and forsaking "his dwelling at Shiloh" (vv. 59-60). The tent of Joseph and the tribe of Ephraim were rejected by Yahweh (v. 67), and the tribe of Judah, Mount Zion, and David were chosen (vv. 68-70). Thus, David is elected "to be the shepherd of Jacob his people, of Israel his inheritance" (v. 71).[41]

---

[38] Hans-Joachim Kraus, Psalmen, "Biblischer Kommentar altes Testament," Vol. I, pp. 532-33, stated that Gunkel had gone too far in designating this psalm as North Israelite.

[39] Artur Weiser, The Psalms: A Commentary, trans. by Herbert Hartwell, p. 538.

The history of Joseph and Ephraim, which is the topic of concern in Psalm 78, is rooted in traditions that are distinctively northern. In Egypt the history of Joseph and Ephraim is begun, and at Shiloh the history is brought to a sharp climax (v. 60). The Jacob figure (vv. 5, 21, 71) represents the people who are in covenant with Yahweh; Jacob is the group who experienced the "glorious deeds of the Lord" (v. 4) in the Exodus, Wilderness, and Settlement events.

---

[40] _Biblia Hebraica_, 7th ed., suggested that the line "his anger mounted against Israel" (v. 21b) is an addition. The verse reads more smoothly without this line, but an absence of manuscript evidence makes the conjecture precarious.

[41] _Biblia Hebraica_, 7th ed., proposed that the line "of Israel his inheritance" (v. 71b) be deleted, but no manuscript evidence is cited.

These northern traditions evidently were included in the system of worship at Jerusalem after the fall of Samaria in 722 B.C.[42] The allusion to the destruction of Shiloh became a warning to Jerusalem; Ephraim and its capital, Samaria, were destroyed because the people did not keep God's covenant.[43] Thus, the Jerusalem traditionists fashioned these traditions from North Israel into a polemic against the house of Joseph and into an apology for the election of the house of David and Zion.

Psalm 81

The occasion of Psalm 81 is a feast at which the act of covenant renewal was dramatized in a re-presentation and a re-enacting of the Sinai revelation.[44] In this vivid cultic situation the audience was reminded of the covenantal demands which had been revealed to their fathers (cf. II Kgs.

---

[42] Cf. F. N. Jasper, "Early Israelite Traditions and the Psalter," VT, XVII:50-59, 1967.

[43] R. A. F. MacKenzie, The Psalms--A Selection, "Old Testament Reading Guide," Vol. 23, p. 78, suggested that the psalmist's style and doctrine have much in common with the Deuteronomic Historian.

[44] Harvey H. Guthrie, Jr., Israel's Sacred Songs, p. 29, stated, "The Elements of this poem may be understood only in terms of the faith and the institutions of Israel of pre-monarchical times."

17:35; Jer. 22:9; Deut. 9:9, 11, 15). According to the Mishnah, the Levites sang this song in the Temple on the fifth day of the week (Tamid 7:4).[45] Late Jewish tradition also connects this psalm with the Feast of Tabernacles[46] and with the Jewish New Year (Talmid, "Rosh Hashanah," 30b).[47] Aubrey R. Johnson presents the possibility that in the post-exilic period the celebration of (1) a New Year's Day on Tishri 1, (2) the Day of Atonement on Tishri 10, and (3) the Feast of Tabernacles on Tishri 15-21, represents different aspects of what had once been a single celebration.[48] A renewal of the covenant would mean a reassurance of Yahweh's blessing for the coming year (Psalm 81:16).

Psalm 81 also presupposes the deuteronomic view of history when the history of Israel is evaluated in the light of the psalmist's conception of the covenant.[49] The distress of the people was a consequence of their disobedience of the covenantal demands (vv. 11-12); on the other hand, listening to God's voice and walking in God's ways would result in the defeat of Israel's enemies (vv. 14-15) and blessing upon the crops of Israel (v. 16).

---

[45] The Mishnah, trans. by Herbert Danby, p. 589.

[46] Abraham Cohen, The Psalms, "Soncino Books of the Bible," p. 267.

[47] "Rosh Hashanah," The Babylonian Talmud, ed. by Isidore Epstein, Vol. II, p. 145.

[48] Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel, 2nd ed., pp. 57-58, n. 6.

[49] Helmer Ringgren, The Faith of the Psalmists, p. 99.

The reference to Joseph (v. 5), the deuteronomic flavor, the reflection of the Decalogue (vv. 9-10), the emphasis on covenant renewal, the putting away of foreign gods (v. 9; cf. Gen. 35:2, 4), and the prophetic literary character are characteristics of northern traditions.[50] The epithet of the God of the covenant is the "God of Jacob" (vv. 1, 4). G. Henton Davies has noted that the parallel of the God of Jacob, "God of our strength," is an allusion to the Ark of the Covenant; in Psalm 78:61, "strength" (עוֹז) is the name for the Ark of the Covenant.[51] The God of Jacob is the God of those who had identified themselves with the "distress" and "deliverance" of the sons of Jacob in Egypt (v. 7). Thus, the Jacob tradition is clearly associated with the northern traditions of the Ark and traditions of the tribes of Joseph.

Not every reference to northern tribal and place names in Psalms is rooted in the tradition materials of North Israel, but many of the psalms have a background in the worship materials which were cherished in North Israel and were transferred to Jerusalem after the fall of Samaria. A comparative study is needed of the appearance of Elohistic themes and interests in the Psalter.

---

[50] Klaus Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition*, trans. from the 2nd German ed. by S. M. Cupitt, p. 32, traced Psalm 81 back to North Israel because of its quotation of the northern Decalogue.

[51] G. Henton Davies, "The Ark in the Psalms," *Promise and Fulfillment*, ed. by F. F. Bruce, pp. 51-61.

D. THE JACOB TRADITION AND NORTHERN PROPHETS

Since the northern prophetic traditions were developed in the same geographical territory as were the Elohistic traditions, points of similarity should be observable between the Elohistic Jacob tradition and the northern prophetic treatment of the Jacob tradition.[52]

Jacob in Amos

The significance of the Jacob tradition in the prophecies of Amos must be viewed against the frame of reference from which Amos speaks. Behind the repeated proclamations of judgment upon the nation stands the existence of a standard of covenant law which was binding upon those who had entered into this relationship with God.

---

[52] The prophet Elijah, who worked in the northern kingdom, is connected with the tradition of the change of Jacob's name to Israel, which took place at the holy place of Penuel (q. v. supra in chap. II). Clearly, the significance of the use of the Jacob tradition is in the name-changing tradition; thus, all that is worthy of note for this study is the recognition that a northern prophet is reported to have been aware of a tradition which associated Jacob with the holy place Penuel.

> Hear this word that the Lord has spoken against you, O people of Israel, against the whole family which I brought up out of the land of Egypt: "You only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities" (Amos 3:1-2)

"The sanction of the covenant law was the holy will of Yahweh, which offered blessings for the obedient, but threatened a curse upon the disobedient."[53] Thus, Amos derives his accusations from quite explicit statements of the ancient traditions of Israel, especially the Sinai traditions.[54] Since Amos was a Judean prophet who prophesied in North Israel, no strong argument can be made for the northern traditions being the only source of the awareness of the old traditions by Amos. Festivals of covenant renewal which celebrated the gracious deeds of Yahweh in the Exodus, Sinai, and Settlement were held in Jerusalem, as well as in the northern worship centers; however, the fact that the southern kingdom was preoccupied with establishing the divine election of David and

---

[53] R. E. Clements, Prophecy and Covenant, "Studies in Biblical Theology," No. 43, p. 77.

[54] Walther Zimmerli, The Law and the Prophets, trans. by R. E. Clements, p. 68; Hans Walter Wolff, "The Understanding of History in the Old Testament Prophets," trans. by Keith R. Crim, Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics, ed. by Claus Westermann, pp. 348-49.

Jerusalem meant that the Exodus traditions likely were neglected.

Amos is commanded to testify against the house of Jacob that Israel shall be punished for her transgressions (Amos 3:13). The evidence which is presupposed in this lawsuit against North Israel is a breach of the covenant which had been mentioned earlier (3:1-2). Clearly, the house of Jacob is the "whole family" which was delivered from Egypt, yet the context shows that the prophecy was intended for the ten northern tribes who claimed Bethel as one of their sanctuaries (cf. Amos 7:10, 13). If the oracle was refashioned by later Judean circles, the house of Jacob would allude to all twelve of the tribes.

A misinterpretation of the covenant relationship between Yahweh and the people who are designated as Jacob resulted in a threat to the existence of the "pride of Jacob" (Amos 6:8). The threat is the result of God's abhorrence for the arrogant attitude Jacob had assumed toward the demands and responsibilities of the covenant stipulations.[55] The pride and arrogance of Jacob was that which the people of Jacob conceived of as witnessing to their greatness; the "strongholds" and all the glory of a fortified city is placed in parallel with the pride of Jacob.[56] Jacob's arrogant attitude had led to a rebellion against Yahweh (cf. Hos. 5:5) and to a dependence upon wealth and material strongholds.

---

[55] Frederick Carl Eiselen, The Minor Prophets, p. 265.

Yahweh takes an oath by the pride of Jacob (Amos 8:7) not to forget the deeds of injustice and violence committed against members of the covenant community. The original sense of this verse is not at all clear; nowhere else is the word which is translated as "pride" used as it is here. Some commentators understand the pride of Jacob as a synonym of Yahweh himself, and thus, pride should be rendered as "excellency" or "majesty" of Jacob (cf. Exod. 15:7; I Sam. 15:29). "There would then be ironical reference to the privileged relationship to Yahweh of which 3:2 had spoken."[57] Other commentators regard "pride" as arrogance which is so ingrained in the very nature of the people that an oath can be taken by it.[58] Although Yahweh should have been the source of Jacob's pride, the fact that Jacob's pride was self-sufficiency and dependence upon material strongholds makes the first interpretation difficult; however, the sense of Yahweh taking an oath by the entrenched arrogance of Jacob is more elusive.[59] Perhaps the uncertainty of this text is the result of displacement in its preservation and transmission.

---

[56] Hughell E. W. Fosbroke, "The Book of Amos: Introduction and Exegesis," IB, Vol. 6, p. 825.

[57] _Ibid_., p. 841.

[58] Eiselen, _op_. _cit_., p. 277.

In a vision of a plague of locusts which would strike the crops at a critical phase of the growth of the plants, the land of Jacob is described as a helpless and resourceless group of people (Amos 7:2; cf. 7:5). Realizing that Jacob had sinned, Amos saw that complete devastation was the imminent punishment; therefore, the prophet appeals for mercy on behalf of Jacob.[60] The people of Jacob could not withstand such a catastrophic plague. Through eyes of compassion the prophet saw Jacob not as they were in their own eyes, a proud, arrogant nation; rather, Amos saw them as God saw them, an unimportant, insignificant, helpless people.[61] This entreaty for mercy served to identify Amos with those for whom he was pleading, yet the insignificance of Jacob in the sight of God was not obscured by the people's boasts of privilege and prodigious citadels.

Great uncertainty reigns over the relationship of

---

[59] Johannes Lindblom, Prophecy in Ancient Israel, p. 224, viewed Amos 6:8-10 as a "free reproduction of something that Amos said." Fosbroke, loc. cit., saw Amos 8:4-7 as an application of the message of Amos to the conditions of the days of a later teacher.

[60] Eiselen, op. cit., p. 271.

[61] Fosbroke, op. cit., p. 831.

Amos 9:9-15 to the rest of the book. The older source critics viewed this passage as a later interpolation which did not belong to the book of Amos.[62] A recent trend which relies heavily on form criticism maintains that Amos had inherited a hope theology from the messianic oracles of Jerusalem.[63] This disputed passage contains a promise of Yahweh which stated that the house of Jacob would not be completely destroyed (Amos 9:8). If the Davidic traditions were unimportant in North Israel, this message of hope for the restoration of the Davidic dynasty would be meaningless to the northern audience of Amos.[64] This idea of a sacred remnant of Jacob is more conducive to the exilic situation, unless one allows that the remnant of the house of Jacob referred to the faithful few who would be saved from North Israel. Most likely a fragment of the message of Amos to North Israel has been reinterpreted for the situation in later Judah; thus, a form of this message to the house of Jacob had a history in both Israel and Judah.

---

[62] Cf. William Rainey Harper, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea, "The International Critical Commentary," pp. 195ff.

[63] Cf. Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology, trans. by D. M. G. Stalker, Vol. II, p. 138.

[64] E. Würthwein, "Amos-Studien," ZAW, 62:10-52, 1949-50, stated that this kind of salvation-speech belongs to a later phase of prophecy. Lindblom, op. cit., p. 281, cited Amos 9:8b-15 as an example of redactional additions.

Amos was a southern Hebrew who called North Israel back to the historic foundations of the covenant faith of the ancient tribes of Israel. The traditions of the Exodus, Wilderness, and Settlement were cherished in North Israel, but these traditions were also the basis for the accusations and condemnations of Amos. Amos uses the formulation of the old traditions which were familiar to North Israel: election was begun in Egypt (Amos 3:2); both the Decalogue and the Covenant Code are evident (Amos 2:6; 4:1; 5:12).[65] Amos 2:10 sounds very much like the creedal statement of the events of salvation which is found in Deuteronomy 26:5ff.

Thus, the Jacob tradition is used by Amos in association with the Mosaic heritage of North Israel. Jacob was the figure with whom North Israel identified as the father of the tribes who were delivered from Egypt and settled in Canaan. By calling the nation back to the old traditions, Amos intended that the people identify themselves with the sons of Jacob who were graciously saved from bondage. Jacob was the ancestor of the true covenant community, but Amos assumes that the people of North Israel were all designated as the people of Jacob (cf. "the pride of Jacob").

---

[65] Donald L. Williams, "The Theology of Amos," Review and Expositor, LXIII:394, 1966.

Jacob in Hosea

Only in Hosea 10:11 and 12:2ff. does the Jacob tradition appear in the prophecy of Hosea, but the allusions to the Jacob tradition in Hosea 12 are the most extensive anywhere outside the Jacob history in Genesis. The vast amount of literature which has appeared since 1942 on Hosea 12 demonstrates the attention which the Jacob tradition in Hosea has received.[66] The obscurity of the text of Hosea 12 prompted James M. Ward to warn his readers ". . . to take any interpretation of these poems as a more or less interesting speculation."[67]

Source of Hosea's Jacob Tradition

Since Hosea was a true member of North Israel, his version of the Jacob tradition would naturally be expected to exhibit more and closer parallels with E than with the southern oriented versions of J and P. The reference to the birth story of Jacob (Hos. 12:3) indicates that Hosea was aware that Jacob was a twin, but the Genesis account (Gen. 25:26) of Jacob taking Esau by the heel did not take place in the womb. The birth story is a part of the unattached Jacob tradition and would have been the common property of both J and E. The reference to the struggle at Jabbok (Hos. 12:3b; cf. Gen. 32:24-32) is an East-Jordan tradition which was at home among the northern tribes of Joseph. An encounter with God at Bethel (Hos. 12:4) is a northern tradition and is concerned with the authenticity of the Bethel shrine (cf. Gen. 28:11-17; 35:5-8). Hosea explains Jacob's journey to Laban both as a flight from his brother (Hos. 12:12; cf. Gen. 27:42-45 [E]) and as an act of obedience to Isaac and Rebekah, who desired that Jacob obtain a wife from the Laban group (Gen. 27:46-28:5 [P]). The geographical concern of Jacob's flight to Laban, coupled with the interest in the context with improper worship in Gilead and Gilgal (Hos. 12:11), is basically northern and Josephite. Hosea's reference to the deliverance of Jacob from Egypt and the preservation of Jacob in the Wilderness reflects an interest in genuine northern traditions.

---

[66] Th. C. Vriezen, "La tradition de Jacob dans Osée XII," *Oudtestamentische Studien*, Vol. I, pp. 64-78, initiated the recent interest. Cf. Edwin M. Good, "Hosea and the Jacob Tradition," VT, XVI:137-51, 1966, for bibliography of recent research on Hosea 12.

[67] *Hosea: A Theological Commentary*, p. 212.

The great freedom with which Hosea uses the Jacob tradition has led some scholars to conclude that Hosea had access to a body of tradition which differed from the Jacob stories in the Pentateuch.[68] Although Hosea does not reproduce an exact quotation of the present texts of the Jacob stories, the fragmentary references to the Jacob tradition in Hosea do not differ enough in substance to infer that Hosea knew an independent Jacob tradition. The fact that a northern prophet is using northern traditions to apply to a northern situation and that the book of Hosea was brought to Jerusalem is sufficient to explain Hosea's freedom in the use of the Jacob tradition.[69]

---

[68] Good, _op_. _cit_., p. 150, "supposed" that Hosea alludes to a story about the weeping of Jacob (Hos. 12:4), which he connects with the oak of weeping in Gen. 35:8. Good

The Accusation of Jacob

When it is recognized that the basis of Hosea's accusation of North Israel (Ephraim) is disloyalty to covenant demands which were known by his audience, the character of the Jacob tradition in Hosea 12 is somewhat clarified. The charge which Hosea is leveling at Ephraim is that they had neglected their duty to maintain a vital relationship with Yahweh (Hos. 4:1ff.). "This loss of the true knowledge of God became clear to Hosea in a unique theology of history."[70] In spite of the mighty acts of God in the early history of Israel during the Exodus and

---

also made the "tentative" suggestion that Hosea's knowledge of the Jacob tradition was gained from oral tradition.

[69] Cf. H. F. D. Sparks, "The Witness of the Prophets to Hebrew Tradition," The Journal of Theological Studies, L:139-40, 1949.

[70] Walther Zimmerli, The Law and the Prophets, trans. by R. E. Clements, p. 71.

Wilderness experiences, Israel consecrated themselves to Baal and became detestable like the thing they loved (Hos. 9:10). Although God had fed Israel in the desert, the people forgot God after they were filled (Hos. 13:5f.). Hosea calls attention to Ephraim's "bitter provocation" (12:14) by use of the familiar lawsuit pattern (רִיב).

The evidence presented in this lawsuit is of a two-fold nature: (1) evidence of a misunderstanding of Yahweh's election of Jacob and (2) statement of the deeds of transgression of the sons of Jacob (Ephraim).[71] Thus, the Jacob tradition served Hosea as a demonstration of what the sons of Jacob had become; contemporary North Israel had misconstrued the election of Jacob as favoritism and had transgressed the covenant with Yahweh.[72]

---

[71] Claus Westermann, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*, trans. by Hugh Clayton White, pp. 169ff., stated that the "prophetic judgment-speech" is addressed to the nation through the use of the idea of corporate personality. The citation of the large number of transgressions results in a division of the accusation into two parts: at the onset the transgressions are stated in a general, conceptual form, and then the accusation is stated more concretely, examples are given, and/or the actual offense is cited.

[72] E. M. Good, *op. cit.*, pp. 139-40, 147ff., recognized a double meaning in the allusions to Jacob: the Jacob of tradition and the Jacob of the present which is contemporary Israel. However, Good evidently did not see the two-fold nature of the accusation. Consequently, he interpreted the allusions to Jacob in terms of the concrete deeds of the present situation in North Israel. "Hosea refers to the Jacob tradition in order to make a contemporary point, both times a point of condemnation" (p. 151).

By using the Jacob tradition Hosea is saying that the past success and blessing of Israel was divinely ordained as the blessing of Jacob their father was the result of divine election. In the womb Jacob was chosen over his brother Esau; in manhood he met God face to face, and God blessed him (Hos. 12:3; cf. Gen. 25:21-26; 28:10-22). A blessing was obtained at Jabbok (Hos. 12:4a; cf. Gen. 32:24-30), and Jacob's God was recognized as the God of Bethel (Hos. 12:4b; cf. Gen. 35:1-5).[73] The same God blessed Jacob in his birth, in his encounter at Jabbok, and in his theophany at Bethel.[74]

In sharp contrast to the divine election of Jacob the contemporary sons of Jacob had become arrogant and self-sufficient (Hos. 12:7-9; cf. Amos 6:8; 8:7). The history of the historical sons of Jacob had been one of the divine guidance of Israel over against the perennial iniquity of the sons of Jacob (Hos. 12:10-14). Yahweh had tried to guide the tribes by means of his messengers, the prophets, but the history of the sons of Jacob showed that they provoked Yahweh by their disregard of the covenant relationship. Iniquity was spawned in the ancient sanctuaries of the sons of Jacob in Gilead and Gilgal. Jacob was guided on his journey to Laban, he was guided by a prophet in the Exodus, and he was preserved by the leadership of a prophet in the Wilderness experience (Hos. 12:12-13). Clearly, Jacob is the corporate personality of the tribes who identified their ancestors with the group which escaped from Egyptian slavery.

---

[73] The interpretation of these incidents from the life of Jacob as misdeeds (Good, op. cit.; Ward, op. cit., pp. 213-17) is likely the result of too much reliance on the RSV translation of Hos. 12:2 (Heb. 12:3). Hos. 12:3 (Heb.) can be translated: "Yahweh has a lawsuit with Judah [Israel was probably the original reading, cf. Ward, op. cit., pp. 208-11] and will attend to [פקד, Qal infin. const., "visit, appoint, attend to"] Jacob according to his ways and will bring back [שׁוּב, Hiph. impf. 3 m. s., "cause to return, bring back"] to him [in a verdict] according to his deeds.

[74] Peter R. Ackroyd, "Hosea and Jacob," VT, XIII:245-59, 1963, has correctly interpreted the favorable allusion to the blessing of Jacob by Hosea.

The verdict which the divine council returned against Ephraim was that Ephraim was guilty of disregard for Yahweh's divine election of Jacob and of deeds of iniquity in the sanctuaries where God had revealed himself to Jacob. The pronouncement of judgment is that Ephraim is bloodguilty and will receive a just reproach for his misconduct and pride.

That the above interpretation of Hosea's use of the Jacob tradition is correct is confirmed by the other reference to the Jacob tradition in Hosea (Hos. 10:11). The Jacob tradition is included in a poem which describes the great reversal in Israel's history; the reversal of the destiny of the people of Ephraim was beyond the imagination of a people whose religious attention was focused upon fertility of nature (cf. Hos. 1-3; 4:6-14).[75] "A people who had been blessed by the use of a good land and who were protected by a splendid military establishment were faced with the loss of both the economic means and the political freedom for self-determination."[76] A pleasant and easy task of treading out grain without being muzzled (Deut. 25:4) is exchanged for the hard work of plowing and harrowing (Hos. 12:11). In insolent self-assurance the sons of Jacob had disregarded that Yahweh had placed them in a land of milk and honey which was promised to their ancestor, Jacob; therefore, the contemporary sons of Jacob would reap the seeds of arrogance and self-sufficiency which would result in wars and complete loss of freedom in captivity.

The fact that Hosea's ideal was a return to the simple, nomadic-type life of antiquity is presupposed in Hosea's interest in the Jacob tradition. By returning to conditions like those of Israel's early beginnings, Hosea visualized the possibility of loyalty to the covenant demands of Yahweh being reaffirmed. After the discipline of a return to the Wilderness experience, Hosea saw the hope of a "remnant" of the sons of Jacob who could grow into a faithful people of God.[77] Hosea expected the nation of North Israel to come to its senses through the experience of a temporary return to the Wilderness conditions (Hos. 12:9; cf. 2:14-15). Thus, the contemporary people of North Israel, who were included in the corporate unity of the ancestor Jacob, recognized a vital link between the sons of Jacob who experienced the Exodus-Wilderness and the contemporary nation of North Israel.

---

[75] For a description of the religious situation in North Israel during the eighth century B.C., cf. John Bright, *A History of Israel*, pp. 242-48; William F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, 5th ed., pp. 150-68. Helmer Ringgren, *Israelite Religion*, trans. by David Green, p. 267, summed up the situation in one short sentence: "The entire book of Hosea is a bitter polemic against the worship of Baal." Also, see Th. C. Vriezen, *The Religion of Ancient Israel*, trans. by Hubert Hoskins, pp. 186-93.

[76] Ward, *op. cit.*, pp. 184-85.

E. THE JACOB TRADITION AND DEUTERONOMY

By including the history of the Jacob tradition in Deuteronomy among the northern traditions, this study is presupposing that the traditions upon which Deuteronomy was based were cherished in North Israel. After the fall of North Israel in 722 B.C., these northern traditions were brought to the cultic center of Jerusalem by prophetic and priestly groups and were important factors in the reform movement of Josiah (ca. 621 B.C.).[78] The central purpose of Deuteronomy can be defined briefly as an attempt to make the old cultic and legal traditions relevant for a period contemporary with the reign of Josiah.[79]

---

[77] J. W. Flight, "The Nomadic Idea and Ideal in the Old Testament," JBL, XLII:209-24, 19, 1923. Cf. W. F. Albright, "Primitivism in Ancient Western Asia," _Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity_, essays by Arthur O. Lovejoy, _et al_., pp. 428-31.

The only form in which the Jacob tradition occurs in the core of Deuteronomy (Deut. 5-26, 28) is a cultic phrase which connects the ancestors of Israel with the promise of land (Deut. 6:10; 9:5, 27; cf. 1:8; 29:13; 30:20; 34:4). This cultic formula stated that God had promised the land to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and to their descendants. The inclusion of all three patriarchs is a unifying factor which was useful in the centralization desires of J. The northern groups which had been displaced by the catastrophe of 722 B.C. saw the only hope of the fulfillment of God's promises to their ancestors through a reform and revitalization of the Jerusalem system of worship. These circles who had originated in North Israel were very sensitive to an ancient confession which summarized the main events of Israel's origin; the people confessed that Jacob (the Aramean) was their father who went to Egypt, was delivered in the Exodus, and was given the land to possess (Deut. 26:5-11).[80] The unfulfilled nature of the promise of land to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the hortatory messages in Deuteronomy suggests that the northern circles in Jerusalem envisioned the reclaiming of the land which was lost to Assyria through Yahweh's use of the unified nation of Israel whose capital was now in Jerusalem. That the gift of the land is a major theme in Deuteronomy may be a result of the concern of the dispossessed northerners for their land (cf. Deut. 4:40; 5:16; 7:13; 11:9, 21; 21:1, 23; 25:15; 26:10, 15; 28:11, 63; 30:18, 20; 31:13, 20; 32:47).

---

[78] Cf. Gerhard von Rad, Deuteronomy: A Commentary, trans. by Dorothea Barton, pp. 23-30; E. W. Nicholson, Deuteronomy and Tradition; R. E. Clements, "Deuteronomy and the Jerusalem Cult Tradition," VT, XV:300-12, 1965; idem, God's Chosen People, pp. 18-23; Donald L. Williams, "Deuteronomy in Modern Study," Review and Expositor, LXI: 265-73, 1964; Marvin E. Tate, "The Deuteronomic Philosophy of History," Review and Expositor, LXI:311-19, 1964; G. Ernest Wright, "The Book of Deuteronomy: Introduction and Exegesis," IB, Vol. 2, pp. 323-26.

[79] Von Rad, ibid., p. 23; Wright, ibid., p. 316, stated the purpose ". . . as an attempt to furnish Israel with a complete order of faith and life which is the prerequisite for a prosperous and secure existence on the God-given land."

The Jacob tradition also appears four times (Deut. 32:9; 33:4, 10, 28; 34:4) in an appendix to Deuteronomy (Deut. 31-34). This appendix was combined with the integral part of Deuteronomy at a later time, but the traditions in Deuteronomy 32 and 33 are basically of a northern provenance and based upon older materials.[81] Regardless of the date, the figure of Jacob in all four of its appearances represents the true covenant community of God. Jacob is the allotted heritage of God (Deut. 32:9); the law of Moses is the possession of the assembly of Jacob (33:4); the Levites shall teach Jacob-Israel the law of God; and Jacob-Israel dwells in safety because the Lord of the cosmos has preserved them (33:28).

---

[80] Cf. R. E. Clements, God's Chosen People, pp. 50-58.

[81] The date of these passages is extremely difficult to determine. Scholars argue equally for a very early and a very late date. The northern viewpoint of these passages

The striking thing about the references to Jacob in Deuteronomy 32-33 is the similarity of themes with Exilic Isaiah, who also viewed Jacob-Israel as the true covenant community. Deuteronomy 32 is cast into a lawsuit pattern, a pattern of which Exilic Isaiah is especially fond.[82] The thrust of the Song of Moses is an appeal to recall the days of old (Deut. 32:7) in order to prevent the people from doing "what is evil in the sight of the Lord" (Deut. 31:29).

The Blessing of Moses describes the preservation of Jacob-Israel as the result of the help of God who is the Cosmic King (Deut. 33:26-29); God's control of the cosmic

---

is somewhat clearer, but not absolutely certain. Cf. von Rad, Deuteronomy, pp. 196ff.

[82] Cf. G. Ernest Wright, "The Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, ed. by B. W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson, pp. 26-67; W. F. Albright, "Some Remarks on the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy XXXIII," VT, IX:339-46, 1959; W. L. Moran, "Some Remarks on the Song of Moses," Biblica, 43:317-27, 1962.

powers is also a prominent theme in Exilic Isaiah (Isa. 44: 27; 45:7, 12, 18; 50:2-3; 51:9-16, etc.). Although the individual oracles in the Blessing of Moses are most likely independent oracles of great antiquity, as was the case with the Blessing of Jacob (Gen. 49), the compilation of the blessing evidently occurred during a period when the security and prosperity of the northern tribes was non-existent. Thus, a prophecy of the blessing of the unified nation of Israel would become an encouragement to the dispossessed people of North Israel who now lived in Jerusalem. If this suggestion is correct, the collection of the oracles in the Blessing of Moses can be dated sometime between 722 B.C. and 587 B.C.[83]

F. SUMMARY

The political and religious situation that resulted from the secession of the ten northern tribes from the United Kingdom contributed to the preservation and significance of the Jacob tradition in North Israel. Jeroboam attempted to divert North Israel's attention away from

---

[83] Sigmund Mowinckel, "Der Ursprung der Bilʿāmsage," ZAW, 48:270, n. 1, 1930, maintained that the Blessing of Moses was a new edition of the Blessing of Jacob that was applied to the time of the national and political reform of Israel under Jeroboam II. However, Mowinckel described E as a Judean work. Cf. Otto Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament An Introduction*, trans. by Peter R. Ackroyd, pp. 226-29.

Jerusalem by creating sanctuaries and cults to rival Jerusalem. The holy places which Jeroboam chose to initiate his religious policies were places where the Jacob tradition had strong attachment. The house of Joseph evidently was anti-Jerusalem and took great interest in the concern of North Israel to revive the old traditions of Israel. The Jacob tradition was one of the house of Joseph's most cherished traditions and would be expected to have a prominent place in the traditions of North Israel.

In the Elohistic version of the Jacob tradition in the Pentateuch the interests and emphases of North Israel are dominant. The sanctuaries of Jacob are northern, and the burial traditions deal with northern heroes. The concept of election is expressed in terms of divine guidance; the election of Jacob is verified in the arrival at the goal which God had intended. The goal of Jacob in the pentateuchal stories is ultimately the location of the sons of Jacob in Egypt so that the Exodus and Wilderness experiences can transpire. The sensitivity to sin and foreign gods reveals an acquaintance with the ethical demands of the covenant which was revealed to Israel in the Wilderness.

Three psalms in the Asaph collection give evidence of the presence of the Jacob tradition in North Israel. In Psalm 77, the recollection of what God had done for the sons of Jacob was a source of hope for one of North Israel's crises. The history of Joseph and Ephraim begins in Egypt where God chose the sons of Jacob and was climaxed at Shiloh (Psalm 78); however, the transgressions of the sons of Jacob had resulted in God's departure from Shiloh and finally in the destruction of North Israel. Psalm 81 mentions the God of Jacob (vv. 1, 4) as the God of those who had identified themselves with the "distress" and "deliverance" of the sons of Jacob in the Exodus (v. 7). After the fall of North Israel these psalms found their way into the Jerusalem system of worship where they were refashioned to be compatible with the Jerusalem cult.

The prophecies of Amos and Hosea reveal an awareness of a distinction between the historical tribes who called themselves the sons of Jacob and the covenant people of Jacob who experienced the Exodus and Wilderness. God had been gracious to historical Jacob, but Jacob had been arrogant and self-sufficient and had disregarded the covenant which God had given to his people at Sinai. The pride of Jacob would cause North Israel to be destroyed, but Hosea held out the hope that a return to the faith of those who experienced the Exodus and Wilderness would mean the restoration of the true sons of Jacob.

The dispossessed cultic persons who were forced to Jerusalem after the fall of Samaria envisioned the reclaiming of North Israel's land through Yahweh's empowering of a unified nation of Israel. The unfulfilled nature of the promise of land in Deuteronomy indicates that the audience of the hortatory messages of Deuteronomy considered their land either threatened or more probably in the hand's of an enemy. The appendix to Deuteronomy was collected independently of the rest of Deuteronomy, but is an encouragement to be faithful to the covenant so that the prophecy of the Blessing of Moses could become a reality.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

An assessment of the history and significance of the Jacob tradition in the context of the history of the Hebrew people can now be made from the evidence in the preceding chapters. The arguments and evidence cannot be repeated in this chapter; moreover, only a general reconstruction and interpretation of the history of the Jacob tradition is possible. The final section of this chapter will include observations on the contribution of this study for future Old Testament research.

A. HISTORY OF TRANSMISSION

The probable setting of the oldest stratum of the Jacob tradition must be reconstructed from a comparison of the biblical sources with anthropological and archaeological data. The Jacob tradition was found to be at home among the Amorite shepherds who migrated into Palestine from the northeast during the Middle Bronze Age. These shepherds told stories around the campfires about one of their hero-princes who was an extra-ordinary shepherd, and possibly a warrior, whom they called Jacob. These early stories were concerned with water and pasture rights and conflicts with outsiders. The basic core of the earliest

Jacob stories ~~are~~ is found in the Jacob-Esau and Jacob-Laban scenes of conflict and praise of the life of a shepherd hero.

The geographical area of Palestine with which these early stories are associated is clearly East-Jordan. How the traditions of Jacob got to East-Jordan is as obscure as is the time of their arrival. Once localized in East-Jordan the traditions of Jacob were associated with certain of the holy places in East-Jordan. During the Early Iron Age a group appeared in East-Jordan who claimed to have escaped from Egyptian slavery and to have received a special revelation of God in the desert. This group became a focal point of a strong religious faith that was interpreted against the backdrop of the Exodus from Egypt. Other tribal groups joined the Exodus group and incorporated their own traditions into the faith of the Exodus traditions, and the sons of Jacob represented those who experienced the Exodus deliverance. The Jacob traditions contained a promise of land to the wandering Aramaean, Jacob, and this promise of land was the watchword of the East-Jordan tribal organization which moved across the Jordan to settle the hill country of the land of Canaan. The tribes which were involved in this East-Jordan fomentation were groups which later were identified as the tribes of Joseph.

In the process of the Settlement of Canaan by the East-Jordan "Josephites" an alliance was formed with a Canaanite group around Shechem, called the "sons of Israel," who were related to the Leah tribes. The Yahwistic cult of the Josephite group (Manasseh) was fused with the El cult of the Canaanite group, and the new tribal league was called "Israel," the name of a political group that had been neutralized by the Egyptians so that only "sons of Israel" remained in and around Shechem. The change of Jacob's name to Israel was associated with the Settlement by the house of Joseph. The El cult at Bethel also was fused with the Yahwistic cult, and Jacob thereby was brought into the Bethel store of traditions, although the Canaanite traditions soon overshadowed the Josephite traditions.

The Jacob traditions remained strong in the East-Jordan holy places (possibly at Gilgal and Shiloh) and played an important role in the formation of the monarchy of Saul. The territory of Saul's kingdom approximated the territory in which the Jacob traditions were associated. The anti-Saul feelings of later Judean kings resulted in the loss of the traditional connection between Saul and Jacob; however, traces of the prestige of Jacob in the kingdom of Saul still are observable.

David's desire to have all the tribes to recognize his kingship and his capital, Jerusalem, as the choice of God was directly responsible for the transfer of the Jacob traditions to Jerusalem. The Jacob traditions accompanied the Ark to Jerusalem and were incorporated into the Jerusalem traditions by a tradition circle which critics designate as J. J arranged the traditions in a promise-fulfillment scheme so that the house of David and his possession of land was interpreted as the fulfillment of the promise of land which Jacob had received. The preeminence of Judean traditions was maintained by placing Abraham and Isaac before Jacob in a genealogical framework. To further unify the kingdom the names of the tribes of Solomon's division of the kingdom became the names of Jacob's sons; thus, Jacob became a patriarch in the United Kingdom. The Jacob tradition was very closely connected with the election of David, but the stress on the divine election of David and Zion in Jerusalem was detrimental to the vitality of the Jacob tradition and the northern traditions with which Jacob was associated.

While the Jacob tradition was being neglected in Jerusalem, the succession of the northern tribes brought about a revival of interest in the traditions associated with Jacob. The prominent role of the house of Joseph in the reform of Jeroboam I influenced the reawakening of memories of the covenantal promises and demands. Evidence of the concern of the northern tradition circles for the faith and traditions associated with the Exodus deliverance can be observed in the Elohistic stratum of the Pentateuch, in the Asaph collection of Psalms, in the prophecies of Amos and Hosea, and in Deuteronomy. In these sources the Jacob tradition is closely connected with the blessings and curses which are a part of the covenant with Yahweh.

After the fall of Samaria the prophets and priests who escaped to Judah carried their traditions with them. A school of prophecy arose in Jerusalem in the latter quarter of the eighth century B.C. and called for a reconsideration of the election traditions of Judah. The Jacob tradition was revived in Jerusalem when Isaiah of Jerusalem and Micah entreated the people to return to the covenant which was based upon God's great acts in the Exodus-Sinai experience. The sons of Jacob were those who identified themselves with what God had accomplished in the Exodus.

The Exile was a confirmation that the people had transgressed the covenant with Yahweh. For Israel to be blessed with a new Exodus, they must become the sons of Jacob and be obedient to the covenant demands. Thus, the promise of land to Jacob could be extended to the resettling of the captives in the land of Canaan.

When the Exiles returned to Palestine, they found that their land had been confiscated, and rights of inheritance were nullified. The dispossessed Israelites soon gained positions of leadership in the religious circles, and a narrowing of the election traditions becomes apparent in the post-exilic literature. The promise of land is limited to the true sons of Jacob, and the remnant of the Exile becomes the true sons of Jacob. Jacob becomes the figure who is loved and elected by God, while Esau is a figure of the outsider to be excluded from the covenant community.

B. HISTORY OF SIGNIFICANCE

The oldest circles who preserved the traditions of Jacob viewed the Jacob figure as a shepherd prince who had been blessed by the guidance of his God. The religious faith of Jacob was bound up with the skills and life of a shepherd people, and Jacob became a cult hero in the context of the holy places of East-Jordan. Because Jacob had received a theophany from his God, the places at which Jacob received the theophany became holy places.

To the tribes involved in the process of the Settlement, Jacob was viewed as father of the group who experienced deliverance from Egyptian slavery. The God of Jacob was identified with the God who had saved the "Josephite" slaves, and the blessing and guidance of Jacob was incorporated into the desire to settle in West-Jordan. Thus, the Jacob figure was imbedded in the basic confession of faith of the house of Joseph: Jacob was the Aramean whom God led to Egypt, guided in the desert, and promised to settle his descendants in Canaan.

In connection with the election traditions of David, Jacob was interpreted as the corporate personality of those whom God had blessed in the Exodus and Settlement experiences. Jacob was the father of the tribes of Israel and the patriarch to whom God had promised the land. Jacob was the tribes who were inhabiting the land over which the kingship of David held sway.

In North Israel, Jacob was the figure in whom the true covenant was focused. The sons of Jacob were those who had experienced the great acts of the God of Jacob. Disloyalty to the obligations of the covenant with Yahweh had produced a group of people who were historically the sons of Jacob, but theologically the true sons of Jacob were those who were loyal to the covenant demands. To speak of the pride of Jacob was one way the prophets could make a distinction between what the sons of Jacob were and what they should be if they were true sons of Jacob. The emphasis of the prophets to return to the attitudes which accompanied the Exodus and Sinai experiences brought to mind what God had done for the people who were called sons of Jacob.

The call for a return to the ancient covenant traditions was also a prominent feature of the message of the prophets of Judah. To the southern prophets Jacob symbolized the people of the covenant. Although the word covenant is not used frequently, the basis of the accusations of the prophets was the demands and stipulations of the covenant of the Exodus traditions. The God of the Exodus was the God who had authority over the cosmic forces as well as over the events of history. God had begun his election of Israel by choosing the sons of Jacob in Egypt; therefore, those who claimed spiritual kinship with the sons of Jacob could rest assured that God could deliver them from any historical crisis. The Exile brought about a reinterpretation of the ancient traditions of Israel, and the tradition of Jacob was a part of these old traditions.

After the Exile Jacob took the place of David in the election traditions of Israel, while the Davidic figure was transferred to a supra-historical expectation of the future. Jacob was the father of the true sons of the covenant, and all others were considered as outside the covenant community and were represented by the son of Isaac, Esau, whom God disliked. The confidence with which Israel maintained the election of Jacob encouraged the growth of an exclusivism concerning the election of Israel.

This strain of exclusivism flourished in the school of Ezra and later developed into orthodox Judaism.

C. CONTRIBUTION TO OLD TESTAMENT RESEARCH

Since one of the purposes of this study was to point out areas for further research, this section will call attention to areas where progress was made and to areas where more research is needed. One aspect of this study which drew together and applied the suggestions of older critics is the study of the relationship of the Jacob traditions to the Shechem traditions. A separate patriarch, Israel, was found to have existed around Shechem, and the fusion of this cult with the cult of Yahweh is reflected in the change of Jacob's name to Israel. If this suggestion is correct, the prominence which Martin Noth and others attributed to Shechem in the premonarchical traditions of Israel must be restudied in view of the influence of the El cult on this sanctuary.

In the Joseph history, two recensions of the story reflect the two major geographical viewpoints of the northern and southern tribes. The Israel recension is concerned with the interests and emphases of the Jerusalem cult, while the more fragmentary Jacob recension reflects the northern perspective. Many of the pentateuchal traditions could be illuminated by a re-examination of the geographical and theological viewpoints which are reflected in these early traditions. In the past too much weight has been assigned to the literary analysis of the biblical sources on the basis of the designations for the deity.

The phenomenon of the existence and value of a northern version of Israelite traditions which existed among the northern tribes until at least 722 B.C. has not claimed enough attention in Old Testament research. Traditions that can be established as existing in the north should be compared with the literature which is considered to be northern literature. Many of the Elohistic traditions of Jacob, which are generally regarded as later than J's version, are in reality older and more authentic because they are closer to the tribes of Joseph who cherished and preserved the ancient traditions of Jacob.

One topic which was only touched upon in this study, but which could have tremendous implications is the importance of the exilic sanctuary at Mizpah in the preservation of traditions of Israel. Although the biblical evidence is relatively silent on the impact of Mizpah, the capital of Israel was located there, and some form of worship existed there. Since the strong influence of the Jerusalem cultic officials likely was limited at Mizpah, the revival of so many of the northern traditions in the work of Exilic Isaiah may indicate that his school did its work at Mizpah.

One reason for this suggestion is the strength of the Jacob traditions among the exilic prophecies; the Jacob tradition is woven into the fabric of the appeal to return to the covenant faith of old Israel.

The major value of this study is in its application of a method of tradition study to a particular tradition throughout the history of the Old Testament world. The longitudinal nature of this study has given a perspective to the significance of the Jacob tradition for the people of Israel that could not have been gained by a more specialized investigation. Although many of the conclusions subsequently will be judged as immature and hasty, the benefit derived from recording the observations and impressions which the evidence evokes is a worthwhile discipline in itself.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackroyd, Peter R. *Exile and Restoration: A Study of Hebrew Thought of the Sixth Century B.C.* "The Old Testament Library." Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1968.

_______. "Hosea and Jacob," *Vetus Testamentum*, XIII:245-59, 1963.

Aharoni, Yohanan. *The Land of the Bible: A Historical Geography*. Trans. by A. F. Rainey. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967.

Ahlström, G. W. "Oral and Written Tradition," *Harvard Theological Review*, 59:69-81, 1966.

Albright, William F. *Archaeology, Historical Analogy, and Early Biblical Tradition*. Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1966.

_______. *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*. 5th ed. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1969.

_______. *From the Stone Age to Christianity*. 2nd ed. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1957.

_______. "The Israelite Conquest in the Light of Archaeology," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, 74:11-23, April, 1939.

_______. "Northwest-Semitic Names in a List of Egyptian Slaves from the Eighteenth Century B.C.," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, LXXIV:222-33, 1954.

_______. "Primitivism in Ancient Western Asia," *Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity*. Essays by Arthur O. Lovejoy, *et al*. Vol. I of "A Documentary History of Primitivism and Related Ideas." Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1935. Pp. 421-32.

_______. "Some Remarks on the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy XXXIII," *Vetus Testamentum*, IX:339-46, 1959.

_______. "A Third Revision of the Early Chronology of Western Asia," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, 88:28-36, December, 1942.

_______. *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*. London: The Athlone Press, University of London, 1968.

Alt, Albrecht. *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*. Trans. by R. A. Wilson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966. (Essays trans. from the collection, *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Vols. I-III.)

———. "Die Wallfahrt von Sichem nach Bethel," *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Vol. II, pp. 79-88. 3 vols. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1953-64.

Barnett, Richard D. "Arameans," *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1966 ed.), Vol. 2, pp. 207-08.

Barton, George A. *Archaeology and The Bible*. 7th ed. Philadelphia: American Sunday School Union, 1937.

Beek, M. A. "Das Problem des aramäischen Stammvaters (Deut. xxvi, 5)," *Oudtestamentische Studiën*, Vol. VIII, pp. 193-212. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1950.

Bentzen, Aage. "The Cultic Use of the Story of the Ark in Samuel," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXVII:37-53, 1948.

———. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. 2 vols. in 1. 3rd ed. Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad Publisher, 1957.

Besters, André. "Israël et Fils d'Israel dans les livres historiques (Genèse-II Rois)," *Revue Biblique*, LXXIV: 5-23, 1967.

Beyerlin, Walter. *Die Kulttraditionen Israels in der Verkündigung des Propheten Micha*. "Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments," Heft 72. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1959.

———. *Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions*. Trans. by S. Rudman. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "Kiriath-Jearim and the Ark," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXVIII:143-56, 1969.

———. "The Oracle of Judah and the Messianic Entry," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXX:55-64, 1961.

Bowman, R. A. "Arameans," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. A-D, pp. 190-93. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

_______. "Arameans, Aramaic and the Bible," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 7:65-90, 1948.

Bright, John. "The Book of Joshua: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. 2, pp. 541-673. New York: Abingdon Press, 1953.

_______. *Early Israel in Recent History Writing*. "Studies in Biblical Theology," No. 19. London: SCM Press, 1956.

_______. *A History of Israel*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959.

_______. *Jeremiah*. "The Anchor Bible." Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1965.

Brinker, R. *The Influence of Sanctuaries in Early Israel*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1946.

Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs (eds.). *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. London: Oxford University Press, 1907.

Brueggemann, Walter. "David and His Theologian," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 30:156-81, 1968.

_______. "Isaiah 55 and Deuteronomic Theology," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 80:191-203, 1968.

Burney, C. F. *The Book of Judges with Introduction and Notes*. London: Rivingtons, 1918.

Burrows, Eric. *The Oracles of Jacob and Balaam*. Ed. by Edmund F. Sutcliffe. London: Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, Ltd., 1939.

Campbell, Edward F., Jr., and James F. Ross. "The Excavation of Shechem and the Biblical Tradition," *The Biblical Archaeologist Reader*, Vol. II, pp. 275-300. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1964.

Carpenter, J. Estlin, and G. Harford-Battersby. *The Hexateuch According to the Revised Version*. 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1900.

Cazelles, Henri. "Patriarches," *Supplèment au Dictionnaire de la Bible*. Vol. 7, cols. 81-156. Paris: Letouzey and Ané, Éditerus, 1928-.

Clements, Ronald E. *Abraham and David: Genesis XV and Its Meaning for Israelite Tradition*. "Studies in Biblical Theology," Second Series, No. 5. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1967.

_______. "Baal-Berith of Shechem," *Journal of Semitic Studies*, XIII:31-32, 1968.

_______. *The Conscience of the Nation: A Study of Early Israelite Prophecy*. "Approaching the Bible." London: Oxford University Press, 1967.

_______. "Deuteronomy and the Jerusalem Cult Tradition," *Vetus Testamentum*, XV:300-12, 1965.

_______. *God and Temple: The Idea of Divine Presence in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1965.

_______. *God's Chosen People: A Theological Interpretation of the Book of Deuteronomy*. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1968.

_______. *Prophecy and Covenant*. "Studies in Biblical Theology," No. 43. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1965.

Cohen, Abraham. *The Psalms*. "Soncino Books of the Bible." London: The Soncino Press, 1945.

_______. *The Soncino Chumash*. "Soncino Books of the Bible." London: The Soncino Press, 1947.

Cohen, S. "Atad," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. A-D, p. 305. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

_______. "Ephrathah," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. E-J, p. 122. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

_______. "Mahanaim," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. K-Q, pp. 226-27. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

_______. "Penuel," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. K-Q, p. 727. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Cook, S. A., and T. H. Robinson. "Jacob," *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1966 ed.), Vol. 12, p. 834.

Cross, Frank M., Jr. "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, XII:274-77, 1953.

_______. "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarch," *Harvard Theological Review*, 55:225-59, 1962.

_______, and G. E. Wright. "The Boundary and Province Lists of the Kingdom of Judah," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXV:202-26, 1956.

Cully, R. C. "An Approach to the Problem of Oral Tradition," *Vetus Testamentum*, XIII: 113-25, 1962.

Danell, G. A. *Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament*. Uppsala: Appelberg's boklryckeri-a.-b., 1946.

Davies, G. Henton. "The Ark in the Psalms," *Promise and Fulfilment*. Ed. by F. F. Bruce. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1963. Pp. 51-61.

_______. "The Yahwistic Tradition in the Eighth Century Prophets," *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*. Ed. by H. H. Rowley. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1957. Pp. 37-51.

Dion, Hyancinthe M. "The Patriarchal Traditions and the Literary Form of the 'Oracles of Salvation,'" *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 29:198-99, 1967.

Driver, G. R. *Canaanite Myths and Legends*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1956.

Driver, S. R. *The Book of Genesis*. 12th ed. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1926.

Dupont-Sommer, A. "L'Ostracon Araméen D'Assour," *Syria: Revue D'Art Oriental et D'Archéologie*, XXIV:24-61, 1944-45.

Dus, Van Jan. "Der Jakobbund Gen. 15:8ff.," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 80:35-38, 1968.

Eaton, J. H. "The Origin of the Book of Isaiah," *Vetus Testamentum*, IX:138-57, 1959.

_______. *Psalms*, "Torch Bible Commentaries." London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1967.

Eerdmans, B. D. *Die Komposition der Genesis*. "Alttestamentliche Studien," Vol. I. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1908.

Eichrodt, Walther. *Theology of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Trans. by J. A. Baker. "The Old Testament Library." Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961-67.

Eiselen, Frederick Carl. *The Minor Prophets*. New York: Eaton and Mains, 1907.

Eising, Hermann. *Formgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Jakoberzählung der Genesis*. Emsdetten: Anstalt Heinr. and J. Lechte, 1940.

Eissfeldt, Otto. "Das Alte Testament im Lichte der safatenischen Inschriften," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 104:88-118, 1954.

_______. "El and Yahweh," *Journal of Semitic Studies*, I:25-37, 1956.

_______. "Genesis," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. E-J, pp. 366-80. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

_______. "Der Gott Bethel," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, 28:1-30, 1930.

_______. *Hexateuch-Snyopse*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinriche Verlag, 1922.

_______. "Jakobs Begegnung mit El und Moses Begegnung mit Jahwe," *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, 58:325-31, 1963.

_______. *The Old Testament An Introduction: The History of the Formation of the Old Testament*. Trans. by Peter R. Ackroyd. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965.

_______. "The Promises of Grace to David in Isaiah 55:1-5," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*. Ed. by Bernhard W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1962. Pp. 196-207.

_______. "Psalm 76," *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 82:801-08, 1957.

_______. "Psalm 132," *Die Welt des Orient*, II:480-83, 1959.

———. "Renaming in the Old Testament," *Words and Meanings: Essays Presented to David Winton Thomas*. Ed. by P. R. Ackroyd and Barnabas Lindars. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1968. Pp. 69-79.

———. "The Smallest Literary Unit in the Narrative Books of the Old Testament," *Old Testament Essays*. Ed. by D. C. Simpson. London: Charles Griffin and Company, Limited, 1927. Pp. 85-93.

Elliger, Karl. "Der Jakobskampf am Jabbok," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 48:1-31, 1951.

Ellis, Peter. *The Men and the Message of the Old Testament*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1963.

Emerton, J. A. "Some Difficult Words in Genesis 49," *Words and Meanings: Essays Presented to David Winton Thomas*. Ed. by Peter R. Ackroyd and Barnabas Lindars. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968. Pp. 81-93.

Engnell, Ivan. "Methodological Aspects of Old Testament Study," *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. VII, pp. 13-30. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960.

———. *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1967.

Epstein, Isidore (ed.). *The Babylonian Talmud*. 6 vols. in 35. London: The Soncino Press, 1948-52.

Faley, Roland J. *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 12-50*. "Old Testament Reading Guide," Vol. 4. Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1966.

Fensham, F. C. "Malediction and Benediction in the Ancient Near Eastern Vassal Treaties and the Old Testament," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 74:1-9, 1962.

Fichtner, J. "Die etymologische Ätiologie in den Namengebungen der geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments," *Vetus Testamentum*, VI:372-96, 1956.

Finkelstein, J. J. "An Old Babylonian Herding Contract and Genesis 31:38f.," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 88:30-36, 1968.

Flight, J. W. "The Nomadic Idea and Ideal in the Old Testament," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XLII:158-226, 1923.

Fohrer, Georg. *Das Buch Jesaja*. 3 vols. "Zürcher Bibelkommentare." Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1960-64.

_______. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. Initiated by Ernst Sellin. Trans. by David E. Green. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968.

_______. "The Origin, Composition and Tradition of Isaiah I-XXXIX," *Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society*, III:3-38, 1961-62.

_______. "Remarks on Modern Interpretation of the Prophets," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXX:309-19, 1961.

_______. "Tradition und Interpretation im Alten Testament," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 73: 1-30, 1961.

Fosbroke, Hughell E. W. "The Book of Amos: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. 6, pp. 763-853. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956.

Franken, H. J. "Excavations at Deir 'Allā, Season 1964," *Vetus Testamentum*, XIV:417-22, 1964.

Frankfort, Henri. *Kingship and the Gods*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1948.

Freedman, David Noel. "Divine Commitment and Human Obligation: The Covenant Theme," *Interpretation*, XVIII: 419-31, 1964.

_______. "The Original Name of Jacob," *Israel Exploration Journal*, 13:125-26, 1963.

_______. "Pentateuch," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. K-Q, pp. 711-27. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Gadd, Cyril J. "Tablets from Chagar Bazar, 1936," *Iraq*, 4:178-85, 1937.

_______. "Tablets from Chagar Bazar and Tall Brak, 1937-38," *Iraq*, 7:22-66, 1940.

Galling, Kurt. "Die Ausrufung des Namens als Rechtsakt in Israel," *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 81:65-70, 1956.

_______. *Die Erwahlungstraditionen Israels*. "Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft," Heft 48. Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1928.

Gelb, Ignace J. "The Early History of the West Semitic Peoples," *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, XV:27-47, 1961.

_______. *Hurrians and Subarians*. "The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization," No. 22. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1944.

Gibbin, C. H. "Structural Patterns in Jos. 24:1-25," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, XXVI:50-65, 1964.

Gibson, J. C. L. "Light from Mari on the Patriarchs," *Journal of Semitic Studies*, VII:44-62, 1962.

Good, Edwin M. "The 'Blessing' On Judah, Gen. xlix, 8-12," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXII:427-32, 1963.

_______. "Hosea and the Jacob Tradition," *Vetus Testamentum*, XVI:136-51, 1966.

Gordon, Cyrus H. "Biblical Customs and the Nuzu Tablets," *The Biblical Archaeologist*, III:1-12, 1940.

_______. "Hebrew Origins in the Light of Recent Discovery," *Biblical and Other Studies*. Ed. by Alexander Altmann. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963. Pp. 3-14.

_______. "The Patriarchal Age," *Journal of Bible and Religion*, XXI:238-43, 1953.

_______. "The Patriarchal Narratives," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, XIII:56-59, 1954.

_______. "The Story of Jacob and Laban in the Light of the Nuzi Tablets," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, LXVI:25-27, 1937.

_______. *Ugaritic Textbook*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965.

_______. *The World of the Old Testament*. (A revised 2nd ed. of *Introduction to Old Testament Times*.) Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1958.

Gray, George Buchanan. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah I-XXXIX. "The International Critical Commentary." Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1912.

Gray, John. Archaeology and the Old Testament World. "Harper Torchbooks." New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965.

_______. Joshua, Judges, and Ruth. "The Century Bible, New Edition." London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1967.

_______. I and II Kings. "The Old Testament Library." Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963.

_______. "The Kingship of God in the Prophets and Psalms," Vetus Testamentum, XI:1-29, 1961.

Greenberg, Moshe. The Hab/piru. "American Oriental Series," No. 39. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1955.

Gressmann, Hugo. "Sage und Geschichte in den Patriarchenerzählungen," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 30:1-34, 1910.

Gross, Walter. "Jakob der Mann des Segens: Zu Traditionsgeschichte und Theologie der priesterschriftichen Jakobsüberlieferungen," Biblica, 49:321-44, 1968.

Guillaume, A. "Paronomasia in the Old Testament," Journal of Semitic Studies, IX:282-90, 1964.

Gunkel, Hermann. Genesis. 3rd ed. "Handkommentar zum alten Testament." Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1910.

_______. "Jacob," What Remains of the Old Testament and Other Essays. Trans. by A. K. Dallas. New York: Macmillian, 1928. Pp. 151-86.

_______. "Jakob und Esau," Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, Vol. II, cols. 14-17. Ed. by H. Gunkel and L. Zscharnack. 2nd ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1927-31.

_______. The Legends of Genesis. Trans. by W. H. Carruth. New York: Schocken Books (Schocken Paperbacks), 1964.

_______, and Joachim Begrich. *Einleitung in die Psalmen.* "Handkommentar zum alten Testament." Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1933.

Gunneweg, A. H. J. "Sinaibund und Davidsbund," *Vetus Testamentum*, X:335-41, 1960.

Gurney, O. R. *The Hittites*. 2nd ed. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1954.

Guthrie, Harvey H., Jr. *Israel's Sacred Songs: A Study of Dominant Themes*. New York: The Seabury Press, 1966.

Hahn, Herbert H. *The Old Testament in Modern Research*. With a "Survey of Recent Literature" by Horace D. Hummel. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.

Haran, Menahem. "The Religion of the Patriarchs," *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute*, Vol. IV, pp. 30-55. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.

Harper, William Rainey. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea*. "The International Critical Commentary." Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1905.

Harrelson, Walter. "Shechem in Extra-Biblical References," *The Biblical Archaeologist*, XX:2-10, 1957.

Heaton, E. W. *The Hebrew Kingdoms*. "The New Clarendon Bible: Old Testament," Vol. III. London: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Hempel, Johannes. "Alttestament und Religionsgeschichte," *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, LXXXI:259-80, 1956.

_______. "The Literature of Israel," *Record and Revelation*. Ed. by H. Wheeler Robinson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1938. Pp. 28-73.

Herbert. A. S. "Literary Criticism and Oral Tradition," *London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, CLXXXIV:9-12, 1959.

Hertzberg, H. W. *I and II Samuel*. "The Old Testament Library." Trans. by J. S. Bowden. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964.

Hicks, Lansing. "Jacob," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. E-J, pp. 782-87. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Hillers, Delbert R. Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea. "Seminars in the History of Ideas." Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1969.

_______. "Ritual Procession of the Ark and Ps. 132," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 30:48-55, 1968.

Hoftijzer, Jacob. Die Verheissungen an die drei Erväter. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1956.

Holt, J. M. The Patriarchs of Israel. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1964.

Hommel, Fritz. The Ancient Hebrew Tradition as Illustrated by the Monuments. Trans. by Edmund McClure and Leonard Crosslé. New York: E. and J. B. Young and Co., 1897.

Honeyman, A. M. "The Evidence for Regnal Names Among the Hebrews," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVII:13-25, 1948.

Hooke, S. H. "Genesis," Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Ed. by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962.

_______. In the Beginning. "The Clarendon Bible: Old Testament," Vol. VI. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1947.

_______. Middle Eastern Mythology. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963.

_______. "Myth and Ritual: Past and Present," Myth, Ritual, and Kingship. Ed. by S. H. Hooke. London: Oxford University Press, 1958. Pp. 1-21.

_______. "The Myth and Ritual Pattern of the Ancient East," Myth and Ritual. Ed. by S. H. Hooke. London: Oxford University Press, 1933. Pp. 1-14.

Huffmon, Herbert Bardwell. Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts: A Structural and Lexical Study. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1965.

_______. "The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVIII:285-95, 1959.

_______. "The Exodus, Sinai and the Credo," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 27:101-13, 1965.

Hunt, Ignatius. *The World of the Patriarchs*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Hyatt, J. P. "The Deity Bethel and the Old Testament," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, LIX:81-98, 1939.

________. "Yahweh as the God of My Father," *Vetus Testamentum*, V:130-36, 1955.

Jasper, F. N. "Early Israelite Traditions and the Psalter," *Vetus Testamentum*, XVII:50-59, 1967.

Jean, Charles -F., and Jacob Hoftijzer. *Dictionnaire des Inscriptions Semitiques de l'Quest*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.

Jefferson, Helen G. "Psalm LXXVII," *Vetus Testamentum*, XIII:87-91, 1963.

Jenks, Alan Wilkin. "The Elohist and North Israelite Traditions." Unpublished Th.D. thesis, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1965.

Jepsen, Alfred. "Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Vätergestalten," *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl Marx Universität*, 3:265-81, 1953-54.

Johnson, A. R. *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel*. 2nd ed. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1967.

Johnson, R. F. "Balaam," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. A-D, pp. 341-42. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Jones, D. R. "History and Tradition in Old Testament Studies," *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 17:211-25, 1964.

Kaiser, Otto. "Stammes-geschichtliche Hintergründe der Josephsgeschichte," *Vetus Testamentum*, X:1-15, 1960.

Kapelrud, Arvin S. "Genesis XLIX 12," *Vetus Testamentum*, IV:426-28, 1954.

Kelley, Page H. "Contemporary Study of Amos and Prophetism," *Review and Expositor*, LXIII:375-85, 1965.

Kelso, J. L. "Bethel (Sanctuary)," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. A-D, pp. 391-93. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Kenyon, Kathleen M. *Archaeology in the Holy Land*. 2nd ed. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1965.

_______. "The Archaeology of Palestine--I: Prehistoric and Early Phases," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*. Ed. by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962.

Key, Andrew F. "The Giving of Proper Names in the Old Testament," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXIII:55-59, 1964.

Koch, Klaus. *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition: The Form-Critical Method*. Trans. by S. M. Cupitt from the 2nd German ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969.

Köhler, Ludwig. *Hebrew Man*. Trans. by Peter R. Ackroyd. London: SCM Press, 1956.

_______. "Syntax zweier hebräischer Namengruppen," *Vetus Testamentum*, II:374-77, 1952.

_______, and Walter Baumgartner (eds.). *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1958.

Kraeling, Emil G. H. *Aram and Israel*. "Columbia University Oriental Studies," Vol. XIII. New York: Columbia University Press, 1918.

_______. *Rand McNally Bible Atlas*. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1956.

Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Psalmen*. 2 vols. "Biblischer Kommentar altes Testament." Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1960.

_______. *Worship in Israel*. Trans. by Geoffrey Buswell. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966.

_______. "Zur Geschichte des Überlieferungsbegriffs in der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft," *Evangelische Theologie*, 16:371-87, 1956.

Kuenen, Abraham. *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch*. Trans. by Philip H. Wicksteed. London: Macmillan and Co., 1886.

Kuhl, Curt. *The Old Testament: Its Origins and Composition*. Trans. by C. T. M. Herriott. London: Oliver and Boyd, 1961.

Lambert, W. G. "A New Look at the Babylonian Background of Genesis," *The Journal of Theological Studies*, 16: 287-300, 1965.

Landsberger, Benno. "Amorites," *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1966 ed.), Vol. I, pp. 809-10.

Lehming, S. "Zur Erzählung von der Geburt der Jakobssöhne (Gen. 29, 31-30, 24)," *Vetus Testamentum*, XIII:74-81, 1963.

Lewis, Joe O. "An Analysis of Literary Forms in the Jacob Narratives." Unpublished Th.D. thesis, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, 1964.

Lindblom, Johannes. "The Political Background of the Shiloh Oracle," *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. I, pp. 78-87. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953.

_______. *Prophecy in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962.

_______. "Theophanies in Holy Places in Hebrew Religion," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XXXII:91-106, 1961.

Lods, Adolphe. *Israel from Its Beginnings to the Middle of the Eighth Century*. Trans. by S. H. Hooke. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1932.

Long, Burke O. *The Problem of Etiological Narrative in the Old Testament*. "Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft," Heft 108. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1968.

Maag, Victor. "Jakob-Esau-Edom," *Theologische Zeitschrift*, VI:418-29, 1957.

Maly, Eugene H. "Genesis," *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Ed. by Raymond E. Brown, Joseph Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.

McCarthy, Dennis J. "Covenant in the Old Testament: The Present State of Inquiry," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 27:217-40, 1965.

_______. "Three Covenants in Genesis," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 26:179-89, 1964.

McKenzie, John J. "Jacob at Peniel: Gen. 32:24-32," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 25:71-76, 1963.

MacKenzie, R. A. F. *The Psalms--A Selection*. "Old Testament Reading Guide," Vol. 23. Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1967.

Marsh, John. "The Book of Numbers: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. 2, pp. 135-308. New York: Abingdon Press, 1953.

May, H. G. "The God of My Father--A Study of Patriarchal Religion," *The Journal of Bible and Religion*, IX:155-58, 199-200, 1941.

Meek, T. J. *Hebrew Origins*. "Harper Torchbooks." New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1960.

_______. "Monotheism and the Religion of Israel," *Journal of Biblical Religion*, LXI:21-43, 1942.

Mendenhall, G. E. "Biblical History in Transition," *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Ed. by G. E. Wright. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1961. Pp. 27-58.

_______. "Covenant," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. A-D, pp. 714-23. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

_______. "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition," *The Biblical Archaeologist*, XVII:50-76, 1954.

_______. "The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine," *The Biblical Archaeologist*, XXV:66-87, 1962.

Merwe, Baremd Jacobus Van der. "Joseph as Successor of Jacob," *Studia Biblica et Semitica*. "Festschrift to Th. C. Vriezen." Ed. by W. C. van Unnik and A. S. van der Woude. Wagenigen: H. Veenman en Zonen NV, 1966. Pp. 321-32.

_______. *Pentateuchtradisies in die Prediking van Deuterojesaja*. Djakarta: J. B. Wolters, 1955.

Meyer, Eduard. *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*. Halle: S. and M. Niemeyer, 1906.

_______. "Der Stamm Jakob und die Entstehung der israelitischen Stämme," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 6:1-16, 1886.

The Mishnah. Trans. and ed. by Herbert Danby. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.

Moran, W. L. "Some Remarks on the Song of Moses," *Biblica*, 43:317-27, 1962.

Morgenstern, Julian. *The Book of Genesis*. 2nd ed. New York: Schocken Books, Inc. (Schocken Paperbacks), 1965.

Morton, W. H. "Ophrah," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. K-Q, p. 607. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. "Erwägungen zur Pentateuchquellenfrage," *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift*, 65:1-138, 1964.

_______. "Israelite Historiography," *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute*, Vol. II, pp. 4-26. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963.

_______. "The Name of the God of Moses," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XXXII:121-33, 1961.

_______. *The Old Testament as Word of God*. Trans. by Reidar B. Bjornard. New York: Abingdon Press, 1959.

_______. *Prophecy and Tradition*. Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1946.

_______. "Tradition, Oral," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. R-Z, pp. 683-85. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

_______. "Der Ursprung der Bilʿāmsage," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 48:233-71, 1930.

Muilenburg, James. "The Birth of Benjamin," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXV:194-201, 1956.

_______. "The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 40-66: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. 5, pp. 381-773. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956.

_______. "Ezekiel," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*. Ed. by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962.

_______. "Form Criticism and Beyond," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXVIII:1-18, 1969.

_______. "The Form and Structure of the Covenant Formulations," *Vetus Testamentum*, IX:347-65, 1959.

_______. "Literary Forms: Old Testament Forms," *A Companion to the Bible*. 2nd ed. Ed. by H. H. Rowley. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1963. Pp. 123-34.

_______. "The Literary Sources Bearing on the Question of Identification," *Tell En-Nesbeh, Archaeological and Historical Results*, Vol. I, pp. 23-44. 2 vols. Ed. by C. C. McCown. New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1947.

_______. "Mizpah," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. K-Q, pp. 407-09. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

_______. "Mizpah of Benjamin," *Studia Theologica*, VIII: 25-42, 1955.

_______. *The Way of Israel: Biblical Faith and Ethics*. "Religious Perspectives Series." New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1961.

Myers, J. M. "The Cultus and Its Significance," *Biblical Studies in Memory of H. C. Alleman*. Ed. by J. M. Myers, *et al*. Locust Valley, New York: J. J. Augustin Publisher, 1960.

Newman, Murray Lee, Jr. *The People of the Covenant*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Nicholson, E. W. *Deuteronomy and Tradition*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.

Nielsen, Eduard. "The Burial of Foreign Gods," *Studia Theologica*, VIII:103-22, 1954.

_______. *Oral Tradition*. "Studies in Biblical Theology," No. 11. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1954.

_______. *Shechem: A Traditio-Historical Investigation*. 2nd ed. Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1959.

North, Christopher R. *The Old Testament Interpretation of History*. London: The Epworth Press, 1946.

Noth, Martin. *Das Buch Josua*. Zweite Auflage. "Handbuch zum Alten Testament." Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953.

_______. *The History of Israel*. Trans. and ed. by P. R. Ackroyd. (2nd ed. of *Geschichte Israels*.) New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1960.

_______. "Jerusalem and the Israelite Tradition," *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Essays*. Trans. by D. R. Ap-Thomas. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1966. Pp. 132-44.

_______. "Mari und Israel: eine Personennamenstudie," *Geschicht und Altes Testament*. "Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie," Heft 16. Tübingen: Verlag J. C. B. Mohr, 1953. Pp. 127-52.

_______. *Numbers: A Commentary*. Trans. by James D. Martin. "The Old Testament Library." Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1969.

_______. "Remarks on the Sixth Volume of Mari Texts," *Journal of Semitic Studies*, I;322-33, 1956.

_______. *Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels*. "Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom alten und neuen Testament," Vierte Folge, Heft 1. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1930.

_______. *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1948.

_______. *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*. 2nd ed. Tübingen: Niemeyer Verlag, 1957.

_______. *Die Ursprünge des alten Israel im Lichte neuer Quellen*. "Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Forschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen," Heft 94. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1961.

Olmstead, A. T. *History of the Persian Empire*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1948.

Orlinsky, Harry M., and Norman H. Snaith. *Studies on the Second Part of the Book of Isaiah*. "Supplements to Vetus Testamentum," Vol. XIV. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.

Parrot, André. *Abraham and His Times*. Trans. by J. H. Farley. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.

Pedersen, Johannes. *Israel: Its Life and Culture*. Trans. by Aslaug Møller. 4 vols. in 2. London: Oxford University Press, 1926.

Pfeiffer, Robert H. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1948.

Philbeck, Ben F., Jr. "The Traditions of Judah Prior to the Time of the Monarchy." Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, 1965.

Pinches, T. G. "YÂ and YÂWA (JAH and JAHWEH) in Assyro-Babylonian Inscriptions," *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, XV:13-15, 1893.

Porteous, N. W. "The Basis of the Ethical Teaching of the Prophets," *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*. Ed. by H. H. Rowley. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1950.

_______. "The Prophets and the Problem of Continuity," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*. Ed. by B. W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1962. Pp. 11-25.

Porter, J. R. "The Interpretation of 2 Samuel VI and Psalm CXXXII," *The Journal of Theological Studies*, New Series, V:161-73, 1954.

Pury, Albert de. "Genèse XXXIV et l'Histoire," *Revue Biblique*, LXXVI:5-49, January, 1969.

Rad, Gerhard von. *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*. Trans. by Dorothea Barton. "The Old Testament Library." Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966.

_______. *Genesis: A Commentary*. Trans. by John H. Marks. "The Old Testament Library." Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966.

_______. "History and the Patriarchs," *The Expository Times*, LXXII:213-16, 1961.

_______. *Old Testament Theology*. Trans. by D. M. G. Stalker. 2 vols. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1962-66.

_______. *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*. Trans. by E. W. Trueman Dicken. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.

Rendtorff, Rolf. "Geschichte und Überlieferung," *Studien zur Theologie der alttestamentlichen Überlieferungen*. Ed. by Rolf Rendtorff and Klaus Koch. Duisburg-Ruhrort:

Joh. Brendow and Sohn (for Neukirchener Verlag), 1961. Pp. 81-94.

_______. *Men of the Old Testament*. Trans. by Frank Clarke. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.

Richter, W. "Das Gelübde als theologische Rahmung der Jakobüberlieferunger," *Biblische Zeitschrift*, N.F., XI:21-52, 1967.

Ringgren, Helmer. *The Faith of the Psalmists*. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1963.

_______. *Israelite Religion*. Trans. by David Green. London: S.P.C.K., 1966.

Robinson, H. Wheeler. "The Council of Yahweh," *The Journal of Theological Studies*, XLV:151-57, 1944.

_______. *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament*. London: Oxford University Press, 1946.

Robinson, Theodore H. *Die Zwölf kleinen Propheten: Hosea bis Micha*. 3rd ed. "Handbuch zum Alten Testament." Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1964.

Rost, Leonhard. "Davidsbund und Sinaibund," *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, LXXII:129-34, 1947.

_______. "Zum geschichtlichen Ort der Pentateuchquellen," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, LIII:1-10, 1956.

_______. "Das kleine geschichtliche Credo," *Das kleine Credo und andere Studien zum alten Testament*. Heidelberg: Quelle and Meyer, 1965. Pp. 11-25.

Rowley, H. H. "Recent Discovery and the Patriarchal Age," *The Servant of the Lord*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965. Pp. 283-318.

_______. *Worship in Ancient Israel*. London: S.P.C.K., 1967.

Rudolph, Wilhelm. *Jeremia*. "Handbuch zum Alten Testament." 2nd ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1958.

Sarna, Nahum M. *Understanding Genesis*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.

Sayce, A. H. *Patriarchal Palestine*. Rev. ed. London: S.P.C.K., 1912.

Schneider, N. "Patriarchennamen in zeitgenossischen Keilschrifturkunden, *Biblica*, XXXIII:516-22, 1952.

Schrenk, Gottlob, and Gottfried Quell. "πατήρ," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, (*Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, initiated by Gerhard Kittel, 1932ff.), Vol. V, pp. 945-1021. German edition ed. by Gerhard Friedrich. Trans. and ed. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1967.

Seebass, Horst. *Der Erzvater Israel und die Einführung der Jahweverehung in Kanaan*. "Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft," Heft 98. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1966.

Sekine, M. "Davidsbund und Sinaibund bei Jeremia," *Vetus Testamentum*, IX:47-57, 1959.

Simpson, Cuthbert A. "The Book of Genesis: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. 1, pp. 437-839. New York: Abingdon Press, 1952.

_______. *The Early Traditions of Israel*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1948.

Skinner, John. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*, "The International Critical Commentary." 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1930.

Smart, James D. *History and Theology in Second Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 35, 40-66*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965.

Smyth, Keivin. "The Prophecy Concerning Juda, Gen. 49:8-12," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 7:290-305, 1945.

Sparks, H. F. D. "The Witness of the Prophets to Hebrew Tradition," *The Journal of Theological Studies*, L:129-41, 1949.

Speiser, E. A. "Ethnic Movements in the Near East in the Second Millennium B.C.," *The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, Vol. XIII, pp. 13-54. New Haven: Yale University Press (published by American Schools of Oriental Research), 1933.

_______. *Genesis*. "The Anchor Bible." Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1964.

_______. "Hurrian Participation in the Civilization of Mesopotamia, Syria, and Palestine," *Oriental and Biblical Studies*. Ed. by J. J. Finkelstein and Moshe Greenberg. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1967. Pp. 244-69.

_______. "'I know not the day of my death,'" *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXIV:252-56, 1955.

_______. "A Significant New Will from Nuzi," *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, 17:65-71, 1963.

Stendahl, Krister. "Implications of Form-Criticism and Tradition-Criticism for Biblical Intepretation," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXVII:33-38, 1958.

Stoebe, H. J. "Der heilsgeschichtliche Bezug der Jabbok-Perikope," *Evangelische Theologie*, XIV:466-77, 1954.

Strassmaier, J. N. *Wörterverzeichniss zu ben Babylonischen Inschriften im Museum zu Liverpool*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1886.

Stuhlmueller, Carroll. "The Influence of Oral Tradition upon Exegesis and the Senses of Scripture," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 20:299-326, 1958.

Tate, Marvin E. "The Deuteronomic Philosophy of History," *Review and Expositor*, LXI:311-19, 1964.

Taubler, E. "The First Mention of Israel," *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, 12:115-20, 1942.

Tkacik, Arnold J. "Ezekiel," *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Ed. by Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.

Vaux, Roland de. *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*. Trans. by John McHugh. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963.

_______. "The Hebrew Patriarchs and History," *Theology Digest*, XII:227-40, 1964.

_______. "Method in the Study of Early Hebrew History," The Bible in Modern Scholarship. Ed. by J. P. Hyatt. New York: Abingdon Press, 1965. Pp. 15-29.

Vawter, Bruce. "The Canaanite Background of Genesis xlix," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 17:1-18, 1955.

Vogt, E. "Nomen Israel in Tabulis Ugariticis," Biblica, 38:375, 1957.

Vriezen, Th. C. The Religion of Ancient Israel. Trans. by Hubert Hoskins. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967.

_______. "La tradition de Jacob dans Osée XII," Oudtestamentische Studiën, Vol. I, pp. 64-78. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1942.

Wallis, Gerhard (Gemeinschaftsarbeit). "Die Geschichte der Jakob-Tradition," Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der-Martin-Luther-Universität (Gesellschafts-und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe), XIII:427-40, 1964.

_______. "Die Tradition von den drei Ahnvätern," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 81:18-40, 1969.

Ward, James M. Hosea: A Theological Commentary. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1966.

Waterman, Leroy. "Jacob the Forgotten Supplanter," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, LV:25-43, 1938.

Weiser, Artur. "Die Legitimation des Königs David," Vetus Testamentum, XVI:325-54, 1966.

_______. The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development. Trans. by Dorothea M. Barton. New York: Association Press, 1961.

_______. The Psalms: A Commentary. Trans. by Herbert Hartwell. "The Old Testament Library." Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962.

_______. "Jakob," Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, Vol. III, cols. 517-20. 3rd ed. Ed. by Kurt Galling. 6 vols. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1959.

Welch, Adam C. *The Code of Deuteronomy: A New Theory of Its Origin*. London: James Clarke and Co., Limited, 1924.

Wellhausen, Julius. *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testament*. Reprint of 3rd ed. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Co., 1963.

_______. *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*. Trans. by J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies. 3rd ed. New York: The World Publishing Company (Meridian Books), 1957.

Westermann, Claus. *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*. (*Grundformen prophetischer Rede*.) Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967.

_______. *Handbook to the Old Testament*. Trans. by Robert H. Boyd. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Publishing House, 1967.

Whybray, R. N. "The Joseph Story and Pentateuchal Criticism," *Vetus Testamentum*, XVIII:522-28, 1968.

Widengren, Geo. "Early Hebrew Myths and Their Interpretation," *Myth, Ritual, and Kingship*. Ed. by S. H. Hooke. London: Oxford University Press, 1958. Pp. 149-203.

_______. "Oral Tradition and Written Literature among the Hebrews in the Light of Arabic Evidence, with Special Regard to Prose Narratives," *Acta Orientalia Kopenhagen*, XXIII:201-62, 1959.

Wildberger, Hans. *Jesaja*. "Biblisher Kommentar altes Testament," Vol. X, facsimile 2. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins GMBH, 1966.

Williams, Donald L. "Deuteronomy in Modern Study," *Review and Expositor*, LXI:265-73, 1964.

_______. "The Message of Exilic Isaiah," *Review and Expositor*, LXV:324-32, 1968.

_______. "The Theology of Amos," *Review and Expositor*, LXIII:393-403, 1966.

Wolf, C. Umhau. "The Location of Gilgal," *Biblical Research*, XI:42-51, 1966.

Wolff, Hans Walter. "The Kerygma of the Yahwist," trans. by Wilbur A. Benware, Interpretation, XX:131-58, 1966.

_______. "The Understanding of History in the Old Testament Prophets," trans. by Keith R. Crim, Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics. Ed. by Claus Westermann. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1963. Pp. 336-55.

Wright, G. Ernest. Biblical Archaeology. New and rev. ed. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962.

_______. "The Book of Deuteronomy: Introduction and Exegesis," The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. 2, pp. 309-537. New York: Abingdon Press, 1953.

_______. "The Excavation of Tell el-Far'ah," The Biblical Archaeologist, XII:66-68, 1949.

_______. "The Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32," Israel's Prophetic Heritage. Ed. by B. W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1962. Pp. 26-67.

_______. "Modern Issues in Biblical Studies: History and the Patriarchs," The Expository Times, LXXI:272-76, 1960.

_______. "The Nations in Hebrew Prophecy," Encounter, 26:225-37, 1965.

_______. Shechem: The Biography of a Biblical City. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.

_______, and Floyd V. Filson (eds.). The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956.

Wundt, Wilhelm. Elements of Folk Psychology. Trans. by Edward Leroy Schaub. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1916.

Würthwein, Ernst. "Amos-Studien," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 62:10-52, 1950.

Yeivin, Shemuel. "The Age of the Patriarchs," Rivista degli Studi Orientali, 38:277-302, 1963.

Young, E. J. An Introduction to the Old Testament. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1960.

Zimmerli, Walther. "Die Grundlagen der Hoffnungsstruktur der alten Geschichtsberichte Israels. Der Bericht der Priesterschrift," *Der Mensch und seine Hoffnung im Alten Testament*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1968. Pp. 66-81.

_______. *The Law and the Prophets: A Study of the Meaning of the Old Testament*. Trans. by R. E. Clements. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers (Harper Torchbooks), 1967.

_______. "The Message of the Prophet Ezekiel," *Interpretation*, XXIII:131-57, 1969.

_______. "Promise and Fulfillment," trans. by James Wharton, *Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics*. Ed. by Claus Westermann. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1963. Pp. 89-122.

Zimmerman, Frank. "Folk Etymology of Biblical Names," *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. XV, pp. 311-26. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966.

Zobel, Hans-Jürgen. *Stammes-Spruch und Geschichte*. "Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft," Heft 95. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1965.

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF THE JACOB TRADITION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

John Gerald Mitchell, Th.D.
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1969
Chairman: Dr. Donald L. Williams

This study of the Jacob tradition was a historical investigation of the transmission and significance of the traditions of Jacob for the Israelite people as was reflected in the Old Testament sources. Tradition-history in this study was not considered as a separate discipline of Old Testament criticism; rather the various approaches to Old Testament criticism were applied to an examination of the traditions of Jacob in their historical setting. The methodological foundations were set forth in the first chapter.

Chapter two reconstructed the earliest stratum of the traditions of Jacob. These pre-Yahwistic traditions were traced back to a stage which would have been appropriate among the Amorite shepherds of the Bronze Age. The geographical area of Palestine which the earliest version of the Jacob stories was associated was the East-Jordan region. In East-Jordan, the Jacob stories were attached to holy places and were preserved by the tribes of Joseph. In the settlement of the West-Jordan area, the Jacob

traditions were fused with traditions of Canaanite tribes near Shechem who were called "the sons of Israel" and who recognized "Israel" as their patriarch. A similar fusion of traditions later occurred with some El worshippers at Bethel, but the strength of the El cults at both Bethel and Shechem caused the religion of the Josephites to be neglected at these shrines. The traditions of Jacob remained strong in the East-Jordan shrines and were accepted into the system of worship which existed in the kingdom of Saul.

The history and significance of the traditions of Jacob in the Judean capital of Jerusalem was treated in the third chapter. The Jacob traditions were transferred to Jerusalem as a part of David's interest in Jerusalem attracting the attention of the northern tribes. The Yahwistic version of the Pentateuch revealed that the Jacob tradition was incorporated into the election traditions of David and Zion, the expansion of the land holdings of David's kingdom being interpreted as an extension of the promise of land to Jacob.

By reviving traditions which had been neglected in Judah after the division of the United Kingdom, Isaiah and Micah recalled ancient traditions in which the Jacob tradition was contained. During the Exile an interest in the Jacob figure as a representation of the true covenant people whom God had chosen was observed in the exilic literature. The post-exilic literature has preserved a narrowing of the election traditions in the Jacob figure, with Jacob assuming the position which David had previously held.

The last chapter was a study of the relationship between the Jacob traditions and the traditions which were preserved among the northern tribes. A distinction between the Jacob of history and the Jacob of the true covenant community was detected in the northern prophets. The northern prophets and priests who were forced to flee to Judah after 722 B.C. were influential in the revival of the traditions of Jacob which were included in the Book of Deuteronomy, the southern prophets, the Elohistic version of the Pentateuch, and a few psalms.

VITA

John Gerald Mitchell

PERSONAL

Born: October 8, 1936, Cadiz, Kentucky
Parents: John Carter Mitchell and Mary Cicero Terrell
Married: Barbara J. Hayes, Auburn, Kentucky, December 18, 1960
Children: David Terrell, born March 26, 1969
Military: U. S. Army, June 26, 1956-June 26, 1958, Honorable Discharge, 1962

EDUCATIONAL

Trigg County Public Schools, Cadiz, Kentucky, 1943-1955
Bethel College, Hopkinsville, Kentucky, 1958-1960, A.A. in Arts
Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, Kentucky, B.A., May, 1962, English major, Latin and psychology minors
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, B.D., May, 1966

MINISTERIAL

Pastor, Belleview Baptist Church, Elkton, Kentucky, ½ time, 1960
Pastor, Cave Spring Baptist Church, Auburn, Kentucky, ½ time, 1960, full-time services, 1961
Pastor, Lafayette Baptist Church, Lafayette, Kentucky, 1962-1963
Pastor, Sanders Baptist Church, Sanders, Kentucky, 1967-1968

ACADEMIC

Interim Director of Admissions, Bethel College, Hopkinsville, Kentucky, January-June, 1963
Professor's Assistant, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1966-1967; 1967-1968
Garrett Teaching Fellow, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1968-1969

ORGANIZATIONAL

President, International Relations Club, college
Vice-President, Ministerial Association, college
Treasurer, Graduate Club, seminary
Member, Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis